Legislature of Ontario Debates

Thursday, March 10—Monday, March 28, 1949

Vol. III, No. 21

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Thursday, March 10, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 10, 1949.

Report of Standing Committee on Standing Orders, Mr. Rea, report agreed to.... 705

Liquor License Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacLeod, first reading..... 706

Township of East York, bill respecting, Miss MacPhail, first reading..... 706

Tile Drainage, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, first reading..... 706

Ditches and Water Courses Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, first reading..... 707

Municipal Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, first reading..... 707

Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, first reading..... 707

Power Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Challies, first reading..... 708

Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, first reading..... 708

City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, first reading..... 708

City of Owen Sound, bill respecting, Mr. Phillips, first reading..... 708

City of St. Catharines, bill respecting, Mr. Martin, first reading..... 708

City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Chartrand, first reading..... 709

Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Isley, first reading..... 709

Canadian National Exhibition Association, bill respecting, Mr. Rea first reading... 709

Sarnia Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A., bill respecting, Mr. Cathcart, first reading..... 709

Township of Kingston, bill respecting, Mr. Pringle, first reading..... 709

Town of Tecumseh, bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, first reading..... 709

Township of Sandwich West, bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, first reading..... 709

City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Patrick, first reading..... 709

Resumption of Debate on the Motion to Resolve House into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost 712

Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to..... 781

Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to..... 781

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1949

3.00 o'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second and final report of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Rea, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders presents the following as its Second and Final Report.

The Committee has considered the following petitions and finds the notices as published in each case sufficient:

Of the Corporation of the Township of Kingston and the Board of School Trustees of the Township School area of Kingston No. 1, praying that An Act may pass authorizing the said Corportation and the said Trustees to enter into an agreement with His Majesty in right of the Dominion of Canada represented by Wartime Housing Limited terminating the existing agreement and substituting new provisions in respect of taxes, financing and otherwise affecting the housing area covered by the said agreement; providing for the erection of a school for the said housing area, and for other purposes.

Of Hope Harris Millholland, Floretta Ruth Sleeth, Chester Holdsworth Belton, William Gordon Link, *et al,* praying that An Act may pass incorporating the Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations as a body corporate and politic.

Of the Corporation of the City of Toronto, praying that An Act may pass validating an agreement between the said Corporation and the Toronto Transportation Commission for transferring the Island Ferry Service and equipment to the said commission and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of Canadian National Exhibition Association, praying that An Act may pass amending the Canadian National Exhibition Act, 1948, changing the membership of the General, Manufacturing and Liberal Arts section of the said Association.

Of the Corporation of the Township of East York, praying that An Act may pass confirming the title of the said Corporation of the lands shown in a certain plan dated the 25th day of January, 1946, and registered in the Registry Office for the East and West Riding of the County of York on the 14th day of May, 1946, as plan No. 3281.

Of the Corporation of the City of Owen Sound, praying that An Act may pass amending the City of Owen Sound Act, 1938, making certain changes in the membership of the Civic Auditorium Commission.

Of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa, praying that An Act may pass

amending the City of Ottawa Act, 1941, as amended by the City of Ottawa Act, 1948, to defer the time of entry by the said Corporation on certain expropriated lands from the 1st day of January, 1950, to the 1st day of January, 1955.

Of the Corporation of the City of St. Catharines, praying that An Act may pass confirming certain By-Laws of the said Corporation guaranteeing debentures of the St. Catharines General Hospital; granting aid to the Religious Hospitallers of St. Joseph of Hotel Dieu and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the City of London, praying that An Act may pass authorizing a By-Law to provide for the purchase of the undertakings and assets of the London Street Railway Company and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Sandwich West, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Corporation to undertake by by-law the cleaning out of ditches and drains; to enter upon lands for such purposes and to levy the cost thereof by a special rate; also, amending Section 2 of The Township of Sandwich West Act, 1939, by increasing the amount of $1.50 authorized therein to be levied for taxes to $2.50.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Tecumseh, praying that an Act may pass amending the Town of Tecumseh Act, 1927, by changing the present constitution of the Town Council of mayor, reeve and three councillors to mayor, reeve, deputy reeve and two councillors.

The committee would recommend that the fees and penalties, if any, less the cost of printing be remitted with respect to the Petitions of the Corporation of the Township of Toronto, the Township of Whitney and the Village of Bobcaygeon, the said Petitions having been withdrawn by the petitioners.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Report agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions. Introduction of bills.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, I move, seconded by Mr. Salsberg, that leave be given to introduce a bill, intituled "An Act to amend The Liquor License Act, 1946," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

MISS AGNES MacPHAIL (CCF York East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Millard, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the Township of East York," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TILE DRAINAGE

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act," and that same be now read a first time.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) give us some idea of the contents of that bill?

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, it represents a change in the amount of money which may be borrowed from $2,000 to $3,000 on any 100 acres or portion thereof. That is about all.

MR. McEWING: That is all it deals with?

MR. DOUCETT: That is about all, yes. And it does deal with an amendment in regard to the Inspector of Drainage.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

DITCHES AND WATER COURSES ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Ditches and Water Courses Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) this bill is not about margarine, is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is it about?

MR. DOUCETT: The Tile Drainage Act. The Municipal Drainage Act. The Ditches and Water Courses Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, but what is the nature of the bill? Let us have a brief explanation, if it is not about margarine.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said it was about margarine?

MR. DOUCETT: I thought I just explained to you it was about the draining of land.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, what are the provisions of the bill?

MR. DOUCETT: There are a few amendments. One of them is regarding an amendment in the original construction, drainage work, that can be undertaken in a watershed under the jurisdiction of the Conservation Authority, without the consent of the Authority. It is amended whereby the section is repealed and a subsection added to The Municipal Drainage Act to ensure that the Authority receives notice of such application and can appeal to the Drainage Referee from the engineer's report.

There are a couple of other slight amendments. In the present Act procedure is provided whereby a drainage work, or part of a drainage work, constructed on a public utility can be done, or charged thereto. We are enlarging that by this amendment to cover cases of repairs, improvements and maintenance.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Thank you.

MR. DOUCETT: And margarine, Mr. Speaker, does not enter into it.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): I have one further bill. Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (CCF Ontario): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) say something about the bill?

MR. DOUCETT: Does the hon. member (Mr. Thomas) want an explanation?

Mr. Speaker, heretofore the Public Works Act permitted the government by order-in-council to pay 20 per cent. of the cost of any drainage over $10,000. This amendment lowers the $10,000, and puts in a minimum of $5,000; it also amends the Act whereby two drainage systems, that is, where any two town-

ships might have two systems, they can be connected as one system under this amendment.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

POWER COMMISSION ACT

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (PC Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act, 1949," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) for a short explanation?

MR. CHALLIES: Mr. Speaker, the only change in policy, as far as the amendments are concerned, has to do with the old pension scheme and fund which has been replaced by a pension and insurance scheme and fund.

There are other amendments which regularize some minor practices and also clarify some other sections. It is quite an extensive, lengthy amendment, but nothing which seriously effects a change of policy, except the one I have mentioned.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

HON. G. ARTHUR WELSH (PC Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1946," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of that bill? Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) explain?

MR. WELSH: There are two amendments suggested in this bill. One is to increase the possibility of enlarging the Authorities. We have had requests from several of these existing Authorities in the province whereby they want to expand and take in smaller watersheds in the same area. As the Act now stands, it would be impossible to do this. The smaller watersheds would be compelled to set up an authority of their own, which is somewhat unreasonable under the circumstances, because it is all done by mutual consent anyway.

The second provision of the bill is this; it is a complement to the bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) a few moments ago. In our act we are cancelling section 24 of The Conservation Act, because it is covered in The Municipal Drainage Act which has just been introduced.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Villeneuve, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the City of Toronto," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OWEN SOUND

MR. M. PHILLIPS (PC Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Parry, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the City of Owen Sound," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF ST. CATHARINES

MR. C. H. MARTIN (PC Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. McPhee, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

MR. A. CHARTRAND (L Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

MR. T. H. ISLEY (CCF Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Robinson, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

MR. ISLEY: The purpose of this bill is to provide additional protection to persons exposed to the danger of silicosis and to those who have suffered any disability from silicosis.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Villeneuve, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SARNIA Y.M.C.A. AND Y.W.C.A.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (PC Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF KINGSTON

MR. J. A. PRINGLE (PC Addington): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Hall, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the Township of Kingston," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF TECUMSEH

MR. W. MURDOCH (PC Essex South): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Patrick, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Tecumseh," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF SANDWICH WEST

MR. W. MURDOCH (PC Essex South): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, and seconded by Mr. Patrick, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Allen, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting the City of London," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. W. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are called, I rise on a point of

information from either the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy), the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Porter) or the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), the Chairman of the Niagara Falls Parks Commission.

Mr. Speaker, on March 7th . . . last Monday . . . the annual report of the Niagara Falls Parks Commission was tabled in this House. The tabling of this report as required by the Act is for the information of all hon. members of this Legislature, yet, Mr. Speaker, three days after the tabling of this report, I find it is not available. I have contacted the Clerk's office, the hon. Provincial Secretary's (Mr. Porter) office, the office of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and the King's Printer, and the King's Printer tells me, Mr. Speaker, the report is now in Simcoe and will not be available for some weeks, and perhaps some months.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps it is a minor point, but this report was ordered to be printed without a meeting of the Standing Committee on Printing, and I think that all reports, regardless of what they are, should have more than one copy made of them, because they are for the information of all the hon. members of this House. I am sure my hon. friend, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will recall some years ago when we were discussing the Niagara Parks Commission, he had a lot of fun with the then hon. Minister of Highways and myself about an item of $800, pertaining to chickens and referring to "chicken coming home to roost."

Mr. Speaker, I do not want this report to have some fun with it, but I want it for my information. The Niagara Parks belong to the entire Province of Ontario, and I think the report should be available to all the hon. members.

I would ask the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy), if there is not another report available, to have this particular report brought back from Simcoe as soon as possible, so we can discuss it on the floor of this House.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): I think that is a reasonable request.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table replies to questions 9, 23, 25, 31, 57, 61, 66, 67, 72, 76 and 79.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Provincial Secretary): How is that for service?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): The answer is in the affirmative.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a matter of great importance to a large section of the people of this province.

In the Toronto *Daily Star,* on February 18th, they carried a news item with the following heading, "Lost Four Fingers in Machine; Charge Girl Not Taught." The *Star,* on the 22nd of February, 1949, dealing with the same matter, has another story with the following heading, "No Instructions; Firm Guilty; Girl 17 Lost Four Fingers." And then the *Star,* on the 28th of February, 1949, has a report under the following heading, "Girl Lost Four Fingers; Company Fined $100."

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I raised the case of this girl in the House about a year ago, and carried on a correspondence with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) during the better part of the year on this question, I suggest that we are now practically compelled to examine the operations of the Factory Inspection Branch of the Department of Labour.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, because, as late as December 1st, 1948, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) in a letter to me—and I might add in parentheses, it was not the first letter, but it was the last—as late as December 1st, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) basing himself upon reports given him by his subordinates, still maintained that no one was at fault; that the law was abided by, as far as the company was concerned, and that it was an accident for which no one was responsible.

I do not want, Mr. Speaker, at this moment to burden the House with all the correspondence between myself and the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) on this question. But it is obvious from the finding of the court that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and his department were wrong; that the company was at fault, and that as a result of their failure to comply with the regulations, a girl lost four fingers of one hand. I say, Mr. Speaker, if this can happen to one girl, it can happen to many people. If the department operates in such a manner as to come to a conclusion contrary to the facts—and I assume the court found the facts to be what they actually were—then how can the working people of this province rely on the department in matters of this kind. It is very serious.

I, therefore, wish to ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) to agree to convene the Committee on Labour, which has not met for five years, and give that committee an opportunity, at least, to examine into the operations of that branch of the Department of Labour. I want to place the information I have before that committee. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) will have the opportunity of bringing officials of the department down, and at least giving the committee an opportunity to find out how it was possible for a department to come to a wrong conclusion on so serious a matter, and how the information was gathered, and how the investigation was conducted. I think we should do that.

I am not at this stage, nor at any time, charging or blaming the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). I know he was guided by information given to him by his subordinates, but I submit the information was incorrect, and the investigation was wrong—if there was an investigation. I have my doubts.

I appeal to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to agree at this time to convene the committee and let the members of that committee go into the matter thoroughly enough into the functioning of that branch of the department, on a matter of such importance as this, so as to avoid such an occurrence in the future, and to give back a feeling of confidence to the working people that the branch is functioning well, and that the regulations and law are observed by industry, and that the health and lives of workers will be protected.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think, as this question has been raised, I should say something in connection with this extremely unfortunate case. I did not like the insinuations by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that "if there was a report" and "if there was an investigation." I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there was an investigation and I did have a report.

It seems this young girl was working in this industry, and unfortunately, during the operation of a press of some sort, a guard on the press was broken, and this young girl did lose some fingers, which no one regrets more than I.

Immediately our inspector, after the case came to our notice—it had been processed through the Workmen's Compensation, and the girl was compensated according to the regulations. As a matter of fact, I would like to point out here that the Workmen's Compensation utilized the clause which gives them authority to, instead of compensating on the actual earning of this girl, they took the average earnings of that industry, and compensated this girl on the average earnings of the industry, which gave her a great deal more compensation than she would have received had she been compensated for her actual earnings.

At any rate, the girl was put in a position of operating this press. After the accident, I immediately sent one of our inspectors out to inquire into the circumstances. At that time the girl had left for Winnipeg. I am speaking from memory as to her destination, but I am pretty sure it was Winnipeg. At any rate, it was some place in the West. She was not available. The inspector did question those in the factory, and the manager, and was assured that according to the rules and regulations of the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act,

this girl had received the required amount of training before being asked to operate this press.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, the girl was not in this province. This report came to me, and I had no alternative but to accept it. I might have been lax in that I did not require the inspector to inform me of each and every person to whom he had spoken about this, but it was not done at that time.

Later I received a letter from the hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and I inquired into it again. I was assured that the report of the inspector was factual, as to what the investigation disclosed. At a later date I received another letter, and I admire the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) for his tenacity, and in this particular—

MR. SALSBERG: My other letter was registered, in order to elicit a reply.

MR. DALEY: —letter he disclosed that the girl had not been contacted in regard to this, at the time of the investigation. With that information, I immediately had the case re-opened, and it was the evidence of the girl that she had not had the training the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act requires she should have.

I did the only thing I could do. We laid charges under the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act against the employer. As a matter of fact, I felt that was what the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) wanted, and we did it immediately, once the evidence was before us, with the result that the court found that this particulur industry had erred, and they had not given this girl sufficient instruction before requiring her to operate this press, and they were fined an amount, I believe, of $100.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): $25 a finger.

MR. DALEY: I would say it was a very low amount. Of course, I do not think any amount of money, Mr. Speaker, could compensate that poor girl for the loss of her hand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: No, but it would help.

MR. DALEY: Particularly, as it concerned a girl. The loss of a hand to a girl is a terrible thing.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the fact that there was delay in bringing this company before the courts, I do not think that anything was left undone. I will admit it did take some time, because of the fact that the inspector had not been able to contact this girl. Outside of the delay in bringing it before the courts, nothing has happened; no greater damage has happened to the girl; the girl was most generously compensated by the Compensation Board, before the question of whether there would be court action or not was decided. It had been settled many months before.

That is the report I have to make on that, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think, because of these circumstances, there is any necessity nor any reason for having an all-out investigation, as the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) suggests, into the administration of the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act.

This is one of those regrettable things where humans err. And that is it.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): How many fingers do they have to lose before we will have an investigation?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 2.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 2nd Order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, at the outset, I wish to say

something about higher education. Before going into this subject, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott). I listened to his speech, and while I did not agree with it all, I will say that the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) apparently in his training at the University of Toronto has mastered the art of debate; he presents his subject with clarity, and with forcefulness, but I am at a loss to know where he picked up some of his loose and strange ideas.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): What loose and strange ideas?

MR. PORTER: I am coming to that in a moment. I hope the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) will take in a kindly way anything I may say in consideration of some of the questions he quite properly raised.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is a great thing for this House to have young men of his age amongst us. Until he entered this House, I think the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), if I recall correctly, held the record, but, of course, that was a few years ago.

On the other hand I do wish to remind the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) that he at one time in the opening remarks of his speech said he represented youth, because he happened to be a young man himself. I think perhaps that is a somewhat tall order, because I might say that because I am 48 years of age, I represent middle age—

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Middle class, you mean.

MR. MILLARD: How old?

MR. PORTER: 48. I am in the same bracket as the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) being under the 50's, and in view of the fact that we are both under 50 perhaps we can forgive one another for some of the mistakes we might make, and I hope he will not take too seriously some of the things I may say this afternoon.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): You do not think we are too old at 40?

MR. PORTER: Are you under 40?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I am over 40.

MR. PORTER: 50 is the dividing line.

MR. HARRY A. NIXON (L Brant): There is a very unfair reflection on some of the rest of the hon. members of this House.

MR. MACLEOD: "Life begins at 40."

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, the divding line is between maturity and adolescence, so I do not know that it is such a great reflection.

MR. MACLEOD: You are south of the line.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Yes, south of the line. I think though, Mr. Speaker, that young men who go into politics, and who take an interest in the public affairs of this country, should be commended and should be encouraged, no matter what their political views may be, and no matter whether some of the hon. members on this side agree with those political views. For that reason, I wish to emphasize that I listened with great interest to everything the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) had to say. I have a great deal of sympathy with very much that he had to say, and I hope to deal with some of the points in a very few moments.

When we consider the whole question of education in relation to our system of education, as we have it, and when we consider the goal upon which the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) casts some aspersions, the goal of equality of opportunity to every child in this province—

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are a long way from it.

MR. PORTER: We have made more headway in the last five years, toward that goal, than during any other period in the history of this province.

After all, even though we may be on the other side of 50, we are not children, and the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) was not a child when he entered the University; in spite of the fact that equal opportunity for every child is something which applies first to elementary and secondary education, nevertheless it has been the aim of this government ever since we came into power — and of former governments as well — to encourage and to support in every possible way the many institutions of higher learning that we have in this province.

I think you will find by a study of the budget which is before you this year, that we are contributing more to a greater variety of institutions of higher learning in this province than we have ever done before.

If we consider for a moment the University of Toronto—the University which has always been the provincial University—the main responsibility of this government as an institution of higher learning, you will see that grants have been substantially increased, and in spite of that fact, as has been pointed out, fees have not been reduced. When you consider the job that has to be done in higher education, and the sort of people who are adapted to higher education, keeping in view of what is being done, and the conditions as we find them at the present time, I am not so sure that there are so very many, who are really qualified, and who are really able, as a result of their former education and of their capacity along that line—after all, let us not forget this, higher education is something that can only be taken advantage of by people who have the sort of inclination towards that education, who have some equipment for that sort of education. I am not so sure that many are deprived of an opportunity for higher education. Higher education is not the sort of education suited for everybody, no matter what his mental capacity may be. Higher education does not provide what elementary and secondary schools provide.

Higher education, by its nature, must be limited to those of a certain ability, and of a certain mental and academic standing, and standings of that kind.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): And financial standing.

MR. PORTER: No, no, I do not agree with that. I do not agree with that. After all let us—

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): How many scholarships has the province given?

MR. PORTER: I am coming to that in a moment. As a matter of fact, I might just as well deal with that now.

MR. MILLARD: Fine.

MR. PORTER: I know, of course, hon. members opposite think only in terms of seven figures, and when we are talking about scholarships for Universities, we cannot quite think in that number, but if we look back to the year 1943-44, 192 scholarships were awarded under Dominion-Provincial Bursaries. During the year 1947-48, 967 scholarships were awarded, and there will be over 1,000 we expect in the year to come.

I quite realize, Mr. Speaker, that these can gradually and steadily be extended. Those Dominion-Provincial Bursaries, toward which I may say the Dominion Government pays 25 per cent., and the Provincial Government pays 75 per cent., are granted not only on the basis of academic ability, but the judges who have to decide on these matters also take into consideration the need of the applicant. If a person shows he does not need that extra money, then, no matter how brilliant he may be, nor what ability and standing he may have, he cannot take advantage of those Dominion-Provincial Bursaries.

However, if he shows he has need of that money to supplement whatever other sources of income he may have,

that, plus his academic standing, is taken into consideration in making these awards.

I have no doubt, and indeed, I do not suggest that we cannot steadily and gradually extend that type of assistance. Let me just point out in connection with higher education, that every boy who finishes his secondary school training has had education free, paid for by the local ratepayers wherever he may live, and by the Provincial Government. He has had that free, as the result of the policies of this government, as the result of the distribution of provincial money throughout this whole province. In some of the remote rural areas, which are poor in assessment values, which cannot produce revenues for educational purposes, the grants run up to 90 per cent. of the cost, and in other places, such as in the great cities, where they have industrial assessments and commercial assessments of very large amounts, the grants are very much less. That is the way it has been distributed.

The purpose of the distribution of that amount is to pursue that goal and it is still before us. I know hon. members opposite may say that within a span of five years we should have reached that goal, but I assure them this is a very big goal. It is something which when you think you have almost realized it, you will find the horizon widens further. And anything in the nature of absolute equality is something for which we must all struggle. We must never cease to fight for that.

During the last five years since this government has been in power, by our whole system of financing schools, we have endeavoured and are still endeavouring—and are coming closer and closer to that goal—to spread this money over the country so that no matter where a boy or girl may live, whether it is out in some rural area or in one of the greatest cities, he shall have as much as can be given by local school boards and by the province and by the combined contributions that are made for education, to have something equivalent in the way of buildings and equipment, and in the way of teaching staff.

By spreading these grants in the way we have, we have enabled many of these rural boards to retain a staff and to build modern schools just as good, just as permanent and just as magnificent as the schools which can be built in the greater centres of population. That is one phase of equality of opportunity.

When a boy gets through, and has had that free education, paid for by the taxpayers, until he is 16 years of age or older, as the case may be, then what should his position be? Should he then say: "I want to go to the University and therefore everything must be paid for me, no matter how long I want to stay there, no matter what course I want to take, no matter whether I am really adapted for it or not"? Surely by that time a boy who has really got something out of the school system, who has developed some mental discipline for himself, a boy who has come to the point where he can stand on his own feet and where he has a determination and an ambition to take a course in a University, surely by that time there are ways and means by which he could get that education.

There are the bursaries for those who suceed in winning them. There are five months in the year in which they are not attending classes and in which, ever since universities have been in existence in this country, it has been the custom. Indeed one of the reasons for long vacations from the university is, to give an opportunity to students to go out and earn money and to help pay their way through. Today they can do that, and they have been able to do it in the past. I can so well recollect that some of the most brilliant men whom I used to know —I am not talking about a long time ago and perhaps I should not get into such a retrospective aspect, being so young—but some of the most brilliant have been those who had to earn their education. They have had to earn their higher education by devising ways and means to put themselves through. It has been done. It is being done.

I would say I agree to some extent with the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) when he says that it would

be desirable to have fees reduced, but let me nevertheless point out what the fees amount to at the present time in some of the leading universities in this province.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): That is not possible where they have to contribute to the family support though.

MR. PORTER: Oh well, I know. In the University of Toronto, the fees paid by the students average $183.50. That is the average for all courses. That represents 42.51 per cent. of the cost of operating the University of Toronto. In other words, the students who have the advantage of that education pay 42 per cent. of the cost of what they get, and they have been educated to a point in the school system where they, by various ways, can "dig up" enough to assist in putting themselves through.

If we look at the University of Western Ontario—and I would like to remind hon. members of this House that any increase of University grants by this government today cannot be confined to the University of Toronto —

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): We know that.

MR. PORTER: We believe that it is in the interest of higher education that universities such as Western, McMaster, Queen's, Carleton College and Ottawa University, should do a major job in higher education. They have the effect of drawing off from this great centre, where we now have over 16,000 undergraduates concentrated, in this university over here. They are decentralizing the higher educational system, and they are providing education much closer to the homes of many people who wish to have access to it. They are encouraging many more people to engage in higher education than would have been possible if the development had been limited to one university in the City of Toronto.

When I mention Western, I want to point out that there the percentage of the expenditure that is made by the students' fees is 46.68 per cent. The average fee there is $162.55.

Queen's University, which also is supported by this government, has receipts from the students' fees of 51.52 per cent. of the cost of operating that university. The average fee for students there is $259.79.

MR. R. SCOTT (CCF Beaches): That is just tuition, is it not, Mr. Minister?

MR. PORTER: That is the average tuition fee. Of course it varies in different courses, as the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) is, no doubt, aware.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Yes.

MR. PORTER: Courses such as those leading up to a degree in medicine and some of the courses in engineering where the expenditures are so much higher than in the art courses.

At McGill University, in the province of Quebec, we find 50.55 per cent. of the cost of carrying on that university comes out of students' fees, and the average fee per student there is $400.22. Therefore, if we compare what is being done only throughout the Province of Ontario with other places, we find that in higher education the fees of undergraduates rate somewhere in the neighbourhood of between 42 and 50 per cent. in most cases. So when the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) refers, when on this subject of fees, to a certain promise about equality of education and ended up by pointing the accusing finger at hon. members of this front bench, and said "What a mockery. What a mockery. What a mockery."—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: And how!

MR. PORTER: —let me say this; it is all very well for hon. members to talk, but is it not a little more important to find out what hon. members do?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: And what did this same hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) say? I remember during the course of the debate I happened to ask the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) about the various other universities in the province, as to whether we should contribute enough to all of them to enable them to do the sort of things he was advocating, and this is what he said:

"We of the CCF —"

We always hear so much about "We of the CCF"—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will hear a lot more.

MR. PORTER: Not you. Not you. I do not include you.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): We of the LPP.

MR. PORTER: "We" does not include you.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): We hear a little bit about the Conservatives, too.

MR. PORTER: All right.

"We of the CCF have always stood and continue to stand for the principle that fees of all universities must be gradually reduced, and reduced, and reduced —"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: "—so that all the people in the province who have the ability can attend those institutions."

MR. MILLARD: That is right.

Mr. PORTER: Let me put hon. members opposite straight. They have a CCF Government in this country. Their party elected a government in Saskatchewan.

Mr. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) allow a question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): We have heard enough from you.

MR. PORTER: Have you a question?

MR. WISMER: Yes. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would point out to the House the amount of money which was set aside in Saskatchewan for the reduction of university fees?

MR. PORTER: I was just going to tell you, when you consider what that government in Saskatchewan does in the way of gilt-edged propaganda that floods this province just before an election, out of the taxpayers' money out there—

AN HON. MEMBER: "Keep Ontario Strong."

MR. PORTER: We find in the University of Saskatchewan—and I may say, Mr. Speaker, the University of Saskatchewan is one of our fine institutions of higher learning in this country and nothing I say has the slightest reflection upon the high academic standing which it maintains and the work it does —but when hon. members take the position they have taken, I just wish to remind them the University of Saskatchewan in the year 1948-49 raised their fees somewhere between $35 and $100 in the various colleges.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Would the hon. Minister permit a question? Is it not a fact the Saskatchewan Government has set aside $1,000,000 for the reduction of university fees in Saskatchewan in the coming year?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Is that to pay back the amount of the raise?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Just answer the question.

MR. PORTER: I do not know what the government does, but I know what the university did.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Is that not shown in the budget this year? The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would know.

MR. PORTER: I have not the slightest idea what is in that budget. The question is, what did they do last year? What they did last year is in the past and what they put in the budget is something which looks to the future.

MR. MILLARD: Well, the university raised it and the government reduced it.

MR. PORTER: It may be, even if they are spending that money, still the fees will have to be raised, because I would like to predict for the hon. member's (Mr. Scott, Beaches) benefit, that next year, the year which will begin very soon, he will likely see the fees raised more, by an average of about $50 all across the board in Saskatchewan. That is my prediction. I think he will find it will come out true; he can write it on his cuff.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just a political "gag."

MR. PORTER: Just a political guess, nothing. Write it on your cuff. But the fact is, this party which believes the fees could be reduced and reduced and reduced—have had them raised in Saskatchewan.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): And raised them, and raised them.

MR. PORTER: All I can say is this; "what a mockery."

MR. LESLIE E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Would the hon. Minister permit a question?

MR. PORTER: Go ahead.

MR. WISMER: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) tell the House in what respect the University of Saskatchewan is owned or operated by the Government of Saskatchewan?

MR. FROST: You own the shoe factories, and everything else.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, that is really the most absurd question I have ever heard. I would think that in the province which has a CCF Government, which believes in all these wonderful things we hear about down here, a couple of thousand miles away or more, you would think you could go there and actually find some of the things—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: Why not answer the question?

MR. WISMER: Would the Province of Ontario admit the University of Toronto is provincially owned?

MR. PORTER: It is.

MR. WISMER: Then why not do something for it?

MR. PORTER: We have put more into it than was ever attempted to be put in before, but all the Saskatchewan Government did—

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I paid an increase of $50 last year here in Toronto.

MR. PORTER: I did not say you did not. In Saskatchewan they are doing the same, but the Saskatchewan University is not as expensive to run as the University of Toronto.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Quote your authority.

MR. PORTER: I am giving the hon. member (Mr. Scott) the facts, but he has never been interested in facts. The hon. members—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) permit a question?

MR. PORTER: Go ahead.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) deny that it is a fact that the Government of Saskatchewan has budgeted a grant for the specific purpose of reducing university fees in Saskatchewan?

MR. PORTER: I do not want the Provincial Government—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) was asked a question. He must have the privilege of answering without interference, please.

MR. MILLARD: We are waiting for the answer.

MR. PORTER: The answer is they raised the fee, and the hon. member (Mr. Scott) says they believe in reducing, and reducing, and reducing, but they have never reduced anything yet.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): They reduced the Tories.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (CCF Temiskaming): How many Tories are there in Saskatchewan?

MR. PORTER: They have all moved down here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DUNBAR: 85,000 in British Columbia.

MR. PORTER: So, Mr. Speaker, to get down to a serious level for a moment, let us consider this; when we are accused of being, what I can almost say "guilty men," may I say that the hon. member (Mr. Scott) has learned the art of debate in the University of Toronto, but I am not so sure whether he has learned some other things about the approach to some of these problems, of getting all the facts, and presenting all the facts fairly, and not jumping off the "deep end" and telling us about reducing the fees, when he should know better. I do not think he does, because I am sure he would not have said it, if he had known. But he should know what is going on, and whether his own party is doing those things which he is now advocating, and I might remind the hon. member (Mr. Scott), if he is true to the academic standard he has developed in the University of Toronto, that he just stick to the facts—just stick to the facts—on some of these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I think this budget shows the extent to which progress has been made throughout the whole system of education in this province, and is continuing to be made, and how that progress is expanding. I have dealt with some aspects of it, and no doubt when the estimates of the department come up, I shall deal with a few more.

There was one thing I would like to say finally, and that is in connection with a subject which is constantly arising.

We must remember in this province that we have thousands of school boards throughout this province, from one end to the other. They operate in different sections of the country, each having different standards of living, and different ways of living in some respects, because the way of life in rural areas is entirely different from the way of life in the urban centres.

AN. HON. MEMBER: I hope so.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member says "I hope so." And there are economic conditions which vary greatly throughout the length and breadth of this province. As a result of the financial policy of this government, one thing has happened, and has happened substantially; that is the increase in the teachers' salaries.

I do not think that can be denied. I know the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) gave us some figures the other day. I noted them, and I have been endeavouring to find out just to what extent they apply to the present time. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) has in his possession, I believe, the 1947 Report of the Minister of Education. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) gave a series of figures about teachers' salaries for the year 1946, and he said that in the year 1946, 45.8 per cent. of the teachers in this province were earning less than

$1,550 a year. If he had pursued the enquiry a little further he would have found that in the year 1947—

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) the reason I used the 1946 figures was because those were the figures in connection with which I was quoting from Dr. Goldring for all of Canada, and I gave Ontario for the same year, to show the relationship of Ontario with the dominion figures.

MR. PORTER: That was not the impression which was given. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) had the figures, and he selected the figures which applied to 1946 in an endeavour to make his point, or to get into the press—

MR. MILLARD: Do not measure my corn with your bushel. Because you want to get into the press—

MR. PORTER: I do not get into it nearly as much as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) does.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not for lack of trying.

MR. PORTER: If you spend a great deal of time determining how to get into the headlines, I suppose you will some time.

In the year 1947, 21.3 per cent. of the teachers of the province were receiving $1,550 or less. I may also remind the hon. members that covers teachers of various stages of development in the teaching profession. As teachers enter the profession, they start at a much lower salary than they get later on. It gives a broad picture, perhaps, but, nevertheless, it does show the percentage of teachers in the low brackets in the year 1947 were just about exactly half of what they were in 1946. If that is not an advance, I do not know what is.

I am going to give this House the figures as applied to the year 1948. I am not suggesting the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) has seen the figures for 1948 because, of course, they are not published as yet. But if the hon. member (Mr. Millard) ever wants any information about the Department of Education, all the hon. member (Mr. Millard)—or, in fact, all the hon. members—have to do is to come in and see me, and I will give you access to anything we have.

MR. MILLARD: I will take you up on that.

MR. PORTER: Instead of looking to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and all the different bureaux, if you want to discuss any problem of education, come and see me, and I will be glad to discuss it with you. I think the hon. member (Mr. Millard) has selected certain figures which show a much higher average than really exists at the present time. Nevertheless, I believe the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) is seriously concerned with the problem of education, and I believe that insofar as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) and myself are concerned, we are in a position to discuss these matters at any time the hon. member (Mr. Millard) wishes to do so, and I will say that no matter what the political persuasion is of any hon. member of this House, if he ever comes to see me about his problems in connection with education, the door will not be closed, and I wish more of you would come, instead of running to the newspapers for that information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister permit a question?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In view of what he has said, and in view of the impression he has just left, would it not be fair to point out that the member for York West (Mr. Millard) did interview him, and asked for certain information.

MR. PORTER: The only conversation I can recall having with the hon. member (Mr. Millard) was that he asked me for a copy of the 1947 Report of the Minister of Education, which

was delivered to him as soon at it could be physically done. That is all he asked for.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has said, and I think my position ought to be clear. I asked him for the report, and was told it was not yet distributed.

MR. PORTER: That is right. It was not.

MR. MILLARD: In other words, that I would have a preview of the statement, and I did not think it was fair to use the figures in that report before the other hon. members of this House had it.

MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) suggest that he had these figures and did not use them?

MR. MILLARD: No, I used the figures for all of Canada, to show the relationship.

MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) mean to say that he knew what the 1947 figures were, but he chose to use the 1946 figures?

MR. MILLARD: No. To tell the truth, I did not notice they were in there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that in the year 1948, the number of teachers receiving less than $1,550 a year was 8.6 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: In other words, nearly one third of the teaching profession of this province in 1946, just at the initial stage of the financial educational programme of this government, were receiving less than $1,550 a year, while last year, in 1948, only 8.6 per cent. were receiving those amounts.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What has been the rise in the cost-of-living index in those two years?

MR. PORTER: I am not talking about anything of that irrelevant nature. I am pointing out to the hon. members that great strides have been made, and they have been made as a result of what this government has enabled local Boards to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) a question, if he will permit it.

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. MILLARD: The point I was making about the teachers was—and it shows in *Hansard*—that there were a great percentage of the teachers in Ontario, as well as in all of Canada, working for considerably less than was being paid for common labour in organized industry today. I would like to know now from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) if he can tell me the percentage of school teachers in Ontario in the public schools who are working for less than $2,200 a year? That will be the point I was making. I was making a point as to whether our teachers are not paid a bit less than common labour in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: You have the full report there; give the House the figures.

MR. PORTER: I will give all the figures, because I am not saying the end has come to increases in teachers' salaries, but I am saying there have been substantial increases. The increase on the average of 1947 over 1946 was 16.2 per cent. all across the board. That is the average. In many cases it was much more, and in some cases it was less.

MR. MILLARD: It is too bad for those for whom it was less. They cannot eat averages.

MR. PORTER: 28 per cent. increase in the general teachers' salaries throughout this province in two years. I am not suggesting that teachers were paid as much as any of us would like to see them paid, but the point I am trying to make—and I think I am entitled to explain my point as well as the hon. member (Mr. Millard)—is this; that as a result of the policy of this government, great strides have been made.

MR. SALSBERG: It has nothing to do with the government whatever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: I will sit down, but I will still repeat it has nothing to do with the rôle of this government.

MR. PORTER: I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that about 67 per cent. of the money spent by school boards goes into teachers' salaries, and if you double the amount you are spending—

MR. SALSBERG: That is the result of the effort of the organized teachers, and the labour movement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PORTER: I think I have the figures here for the three years, and it might be well for me to put them on the record. I am sure the hon. members will be interested, in spite of our little crossfire.

MR. MILLARD: Sure; I have the record here, too.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) was referring in his figures, I think, to the public schools, and we have here the average salaries. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) quoted certain average salaries, but I may say, of course, that average salaries do not give the whole picture. It is just like the boy who was drowned in a river when he got beyond his depth, and yet the average depth of the river was only two feet. So that averages themselves do not give the whole picture as to what is happening, but it gives a very general view of the substantial increases which have been made.

In the ordinary rural schools in 1946 the average salary was $1,366. In 1947 it was $1,580, and in 1948-49 it was $1,711. In towns and villages under 1,500 the salaries moved up in this way: $1,446 to $1,690 to $1,824. In towns and villages over 1,500 it was $1,591, $1,874 and $2,017. In large semi-urban public schools it was, in 1946, $1,813, in 1947, $2,230, and in 1948, $2,251. In cities it went from $2,026 in 1946 to $2,316 and $2,529 in 1948, and 1949. And, of course, in the modern schools the salaries are on a much higher scale. If we look at secondary school salaries we find that the high and collegiate schools principals, the average runs from $3,406, $3,666, $3,741. Male assistants, from $2,720, $2,938, $3,098. Female assistants, $2,395, $2,643, $2,817. The average all told, of that group was $2,632, $2,866 and $3,033. That indicates not the ultimate, but it indicates a very substantial steady progressive increase, a very substantial, progressive increase which has been brought about as the result of the facilities that have been provided.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) permit a question before he leaves those figures? I wonder if he has the figures for overall averages for public school teachers. He gave the figures broken down as between different types.

MR. PORTER: Yes, I think it is here—1,664.

MR. MILLARD: That is one I gave?

MR. PORTER: Yes. It is perfectly correct. I am not suggesting that the hon. member (Mr. Millard) did not properly read what that was. I do not suggest that for a moment. For 1945-1948-49 it is $2,083. That is the average across the board.

MR. FROST: That shows the increases that are being made by good government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Still less than labour in factories.

MR. PORTER: I think it is only fair to remember that I am not for one moment stating that this is the ultimate. Everything has been done that will be done. I am merely pointing out the substantial quantity of the increase all across the board on the average. In some places they have been quite spectacular. In other places, where conditions are a little different and where they have different problems and general living conditions are lower, is where you will find lower salaries, and in the greater cities the salaries have been raised at a much higher rate. But the thing of real importance is that in the teaching profession there are many teachers. It is all very well to compare the salaries of teachers with the prevailing wages in any one type of work that might be going on at the present time in this country, but the teacher who goes into the teaching profession, if he continues in the profession, has the prospect of steady and gradual increases from year to year. He has the privilege of substantial holidays, two months in the summer, time at Easter and at Christmas and that is an advantage which cannot be denied. He has the advantage of superannuation. I can assure the hon. members I will be ready to introduce that bill very soon, and I think the hon. members will agree when that bill is introduced, the whole scheme of superannuation for teachers will also show a very great improvement. They have all these advantages, and in addition the great advantage of being in a profession where they have an opportunity of moulding the characters and the lives of the young people of this country. A profession is not a trade. A profession is not an activity which people go into just to a make a living. A profession is something people go into because they are devoted to it; because they are ambitious to pursue that calling, not only in the interests of themselves but to a very large extent as a contribution to society, and that is what school-teachers do, and that is why, no matter—

MR. MILLARD: Then you should be penalized for doing that, no matter what the condition has been in the country in the past, no matter what salaries have been paid to teachers in the past.

MR. PORTER: Notwithstanding, it has been shown about the same percentage of matriculants go into the Ontario teaching profession, irrespective of certain conditions. There are certain people who adopt the teaching profession, and no matter what they are paid, they will teach and it is in our interest in this country that the salaries of teachers should be steadily raised insofar as the economical ability of this country can be applied to that very essential purpose. They deserve it. They should have it and anything we can do to improve the economical condition of teachers is something which should be very close to the heart of every hon. member of this Legislature. With that I am sure nobody here would disagree. That is what we have attempted to do, and that is what we, to a substantial extent, have done, and that is what we are continuing to do by the whole programme which has been laid down and carried out.

And I say, finally, in considering the budget of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that we must consider it as a whole. It is a very easy thing to go out on the campus at the university and tell the students "We are going to cut your fees." I have no doubt 100 per cent. would agree to such a proposition. It is all very well to go out and broadcast to the people, "We are going to do this and that for them." But let us remember this; when we are considering the university there are many people who live in this city, in the country and in other places, who see this budget and they see $25,000,000 going to be paid to the University of Toronto, and they ask "What is happening with that money?" We are taxpayers, and most of the taxpayers mainly are men who have not the advantage of a university

education and they want to know who are we educating and what for and what is really meant by that.

I listened with very great interest to the speech of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) and, irrespective of the fact I disagreed with some of the propositions he put forward, nevertheless, as I said before, I believe he has a profound interest in education and I think the Labour movement is profoundly interested in education and in the opportunity for their children to be educated. That is exactly what we are trying to do, and if the opportunity presents itself, we will expend what we have been doing. But we must remember if we allot too much money to any one purpose in the budget, we have to consider what effect that will have on some other service which this province is called upon by the public to render, and when anything goes up, then there is a claim for something else. We must remember also that these commitments to School Boards, which will amount to $3,000,000 more than last year and several times more than five years ago, cannot just be called off at any moment. It is a commitment which will have to be substantially carried on from year to year, and if we do not regard the budget from a long-term viewpoint, and take into consideration the demands of all sections of our public, we are bound to get into trouble. But we have moved deliberately and we have extended substantially in a big way in almost every single line of provincial endeavour and we have done more than what was ever done previously.

MR. MILLARD: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) permit one question? You raised the question, and you paid us the honour of saying we were profoundly interested in the education of labour. I just want you to answer my question now. If you say so, you can wait until the Estimates come up, but I notice in the Estimates there has been no lift in the amounts set aside for primary adult labour education. I am referring to the Workers' Educational Grant and Workers' Adult Education, $4,000 in one case and $500 in the other. Now, there has been no change. It seems to me that is a very "pigmy" amount for this great task of organizing these people who do not get the opportunity in school and have not had the opportunity since there is nothing provided in the Department of Labour; there is in the Department of Education—but nothing in the Department of Labour—and only about $9,000 in the Department of Education. I would like to know if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) can find some other way to meet this great problem.

MR. PORTER: I am quite happy to deal with this point. There are other provisions in the budget for expanded educational opportunities for adults in addition to the grant that is given to the Educational Association, and as to the grant to the Educational Association, that is the same as it was for many years. After all, that is a voluntary organization which has been receiving support from this government and I think you will find that all those grants to voluntary organizations have not been raised. It is one of the great difficulties with which we are faced. We have many claims upon the provincial treasury for these various organizations and from year to year we have been prevailed to give grants to various voluntary organizations, and if you go over the list you will find a great many organizations receiving grants, but we have no control over those organizations. They are voluntary organizations and we have always taken the position that any voluntary organization getting a grant from this government, should have a relatively small grant. As long as they carry on in their own way and "run their own show" we should not be in a position of giving them such a large proportion of their budget, or before long we will have to run them or bail them out. That is the principle we have adopted.

Another thing I would like to say is this: when I mentioned the profound interest of the Labour movement in education, my remarks are not confined merely to their interest in education with reference to the Labour movement. I

would like to commend the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) on the speech he made. I would say that speech indicated a much broader interest in education than in any special field. The hon. member (Mr. Harvey) indicated that, from this point of view, Labour was interested in humanity, in education of a general character, which will build up the culture of this country and give people something worth living for.

That is a very broad conception, and that, I may say, is what I admire and if it is worth anything, I would most heartily commend it.

I might say, in the Community Programmes Branch, which I discussed the other night—I do not know whether the hon. member (Mr. Millard) was present—a development which applies to all members of the community, it does not apply to any one class or any one section. It has been growing at a very great rate and I will deal with that in the estimates of what is being done for the immigrants, the displaced persons, coming into this country. We are teaching them English and other subjects which will be of some assistance to them. In other words, these Estimates, in one place or another, will reflect what is being done in different ways to give education to adults as well as children. Children have to come first in an educational system, but I find a great deal is being done all along the line.

MR. R. SCOTT (CCF Beaches): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) answer one question in regard to university students? Would he say a word about grants to needy students, other than the Dominion-Provincial Bursaries? Could he say a few words as to what assistance they are giving to needy students?

MR. PORTER: The Dominion-Provincial Bursaries are the only thing of that kind, but I understand the board of governors at the university have a fund for needy students. They have a system of their own which is made use of to a considerable extent.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): But is that the only financial assistance?

MR. PORTER: No, aside from direct financial assistance of the $2,500,000 we pay to the university, which is 60 per cent. of the cost, the Dominion-Provincial Bursaries are the only other direct provision we are making today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, it is with some humility I follow the illustrious hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) in this debate. If the cheap wit and unusually low calibre of his remarks on Tuesday night are indicative of his ability and that being so I would strongly urge upon his government that they secure a new Minister of Education. After listening to him I was reminded of a few lines from Shakespeare, "what manner of meat doth this Caesar eat that maketh him wax so great." I have seldom listened to such an exhibition of boot-licking as was presented in the debate Tuesday night in regard to the former leader, George Drew. I think his entry into the contest for premier was so much "window dressing," but I am sure his abject servility to his bosses—Mr. Drew and Mr. McCullough, may well place him in the forefront.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LEAVENS: I want to deal next, Mr. Speaker, with a question.

MR. DUNBAR: I have seen you on a soap box.

MR. LEAVENS: Something that reflects on the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), who just got up from his seat. I would like to have the answer to my question from the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) if he is able to give it at this time. If not, then in the discussion of the Estimates. I have here a brief presented to me by the jail guards of the City of Toronto of the Toronto County Jail. I would like to read from this brief in part, to find out just who

has the jurisdiction over the county jail guards. I find they are people without a country.

MR. DUNBAR: Please do not get mixed up. Toronto Jail is a city jail, it is not a county jail.

MR. LEAVENS: It does not matter whether it is a city or a county jail, the same condition exists. What I want to find out, is, who has the jurisdiction over the guards of the Toronto City Jail? Who lays down what their duties are, who states what their salaries should be, who suggests what their bargaining power should be and whom they should approach in regard to wages and other working conditions. I was three days on the telephone. The first one I called was your Deputy Minister, Mr. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Dunbar), and I asked him who had jurisdiction over the Toronto Jail guards. He said the Department of Reform Institutions, so I thought I had the answer. I got in touch with the boys who had come to see me about this question and told them the Department of Reform Institutions was the direct boss of the guards, and they should apply to the Civil Service Association for membership in the Association. I think 70 of them sent along their fees and when the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Dunbar) heard of it he sent a very scathing letter to the secretary of the Civil Service Association, which I hold in my hand, in which he says:

MR. DUNBAR: Go ahead and read it.

MR. LEAVENS: He says:

> "The employees are not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Reform Institutions and they cannot belong to the Civil Service Association."

Correct, Mr. hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar)?

MR. DUNBAR: Well, last year when you were not with us, Mr. Overnight Guest—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR: —an Act went through this House for superannuation and now an Act is going through for holidays with pay, and they are now under the Civil Service, but they were not before. There was not anyone who was much interested in it. The Toronto City Council which you talk so much about would not do it.

MR. LEAVENS: I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that insults do not answer questions. He is very good with his insults, but not so good answering questions.

MR. DUNBAR: What question do you want answered? What was your question?

MR. LEAVENS: The question I have put was, whose jurisdiction are they under?

MR. DUNBAR: I told you of my jurisdiction for superannuation.

MR. LEAVENS: I am not talking about superannuation of civil servants.

MR. DUNBAR: Take your soap box.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LEAVENS: Mr. Speaker, I can see the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) does not know or is not willing to tell. I suppose I will again have to approach his Deputy Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LEAVENS: Not long since talking to these men from Toronto Jail, I found that they were not paid for time lost through sickness, they were not paid for injury, they did not come under the compensation and they did not come under any superannuation or pension plan. One chap, whose name I have—and if it is necessary to mention it I will—was on two weeks' holidays and he died three days before his holidays were up. When you sent the cheque, which was paid after his

holidays were over, you took out his three days' pay for three days, as he died during his holidays.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Explain that, George (Mr. Dunbar).

MR. DUNBAR: Can you tell me of any law which will pay a man when he is dead? I would like to know of it.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (CCF Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, they just increased, George (Mr. Dunbar) by $2,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR: Just as silly as the question.

MR. LEAVENS: I am trying to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) in connection with these jail guards, that I tried to do something for them. They were informed by the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that they could not belong to the Civil Service Association. I think we have established that, if nothing else. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) reminds me of a Biblical character by the name of Zacchias. He became famous in history as a man up a tree, very much like the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Dunbar), with the exception that he is always up a tree. Also, when Zacchias was up a tree, he knew enough to keep his mouth shut.

MR. DUNBAR: That is your soap box.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give it to him again, Bert (Mr. Leavens).

MR. LEAVENS: I am glad to find out something from the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar). I have not been able to get anything from him before.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (PC Minister without Portfolio): Was Zacchias not a tax collector?

MR. LEAVENS: You go and check up on your script and I will check with you later. I am glad I have found out from the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that, at least, the jail guards are partially under his jurisdiction.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): You are learning something every day.

MR. LEAVENS: That is right, I do not often get very much from you, but I have today.

MR. DUNBAR: You are a union man, you know the union men in the City of Toronto came to me to see what could be done about guards at the Toronto Jail being put on superannuation. They have a letter saying "we will pay the government dollar for dollar for what you pay for superannuation."

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): And you told the union they could not bargain for it.

MR. LEAVENS: I may say, Mr. Speaker, every time the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) opens his face, he puts his foot in it.

MR. DUNBAR: Do you mean to say you are a union man?

MR. WISMER: Yes, and this jail is in my riding.

MR. DUNBAR: You should be inside along with some of the others.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: We must have order.

MR. LEAVENS: I shall now get in touch with those employees and tell them to get in touch with the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Dunbar) to find out what their status is because, even after all this I am still at a loss.

MR. DUNBAR: I think you are always at a loss.

MR. WISMER: With whom did they bargain?

MR. LEAVENS: That is what I am trying to find out.

MR. DUNBAR: It is a city jail; different from a county jail.

MR. WISMER: Never belonged to the union?

MR. DUNBAR: No, nor any of our institutions. Is that an answer for you?

MR. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Just a moment, please. I will have to ask the hon. members to hold their cross-fire while the hon. member (Mr. Leavens) finishes his talk.

MR. DUNBAR: No, but they plant these men out in the corridors to start a riot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. DUNBAR: To start a riot in the gaol.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DUNBAR: You have planned deliberately to start a riot in the gaols; either to start a riot or burn it. You certainly have.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will start one in here in a moment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DUNBAR: That is the object of this, to start a riot?

AN HON. MEMBER: In here?

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): Not in here.

MR. LEAVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, I want to know. I am still at a loss to know with whom the Toronto gaol guards bargain, whether they bargain with the Department of Reform Institutions or whether they bargain with the Board of Control of the City of Toronto. I want to know, and if an hon. Minister of the Crown cannot tell me, who in Heaven's name can?

I do not think there is much use in going further with this, except to say this: I know that in 1948 the superannuation plan was brought in for the gaol guards. I know also that men who had worked 20 to 25 years in the gaol as guards found there was no retroactive clause in that pension plan to bring them up to date, or give them a decent pension when they have to retire in another 5 or 6 years. I want to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister that that clause should be in there. You expect honesty from your gaol guards, you expect men there of good character, men who will see the gaol is properly run, yet you pay them a maximum of $2,000 a year, and a minimum salary of $1,550, and that under present living conditions.

Their scale of hours is 7 days a week, because they are on an emergency job, and every one of them is sworn in as soon as he takes on his duties as a special constable, so prisoners can be transferred from one place in Ontario to another.

I am not going to carry this any further. I had hoped to get some satisfaction from the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) on the floor this afternoon, but I see he is not prepared to give much, and there is no use urging him further.

What I told him when I was speaking about the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), that will come later, I have to get to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Got right under his skin, too.

MR. LEAVENS: The next matter I want to bring up is a question in which I think we all ought to be vitally interested, the question of old-age pension. It is a matter of great concern to me, and amazement as well, that every time—

MR. DUNBAR: Now, are you—

MR. LEAVENS: —every time someone in the House mentions old-age pensions—

MR. DUNBAR: Are you through with the gaol now?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hurry back, George.

MR. DUNBAR: Come down when we have the psychologists, we will be glad to give you a test any time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will you go with us, George?

MR. DUNBAR: We will "riot" you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of amazement to me when anybody on this side of the House happens to mention anything about old-age pensions, to see the smug, complacent, satisfied look on the faces of the Cabinet Ministers.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): You should see what you look like.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: Of course it may be that they live in a different world. It may be they are not acquainted with real life in this province. It may be they have never tasted the bitter dregs of a society that denies old people a right to live and live decently.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: Maybe they do not know. If they do not know, I would like them to say so, so we can tell them. I think it is a crying shame that old folk of 70—you know the Bible says the span of a man's life shall be threescore years and ten; that is 70, as I figure arithmetic, and yet the Bible says that it is his expectancy of life . . . . Therefore, governments knowing that is his expectancy of life and that it will not likely exceed 70, start a pension when they expect him to be dead. If he is not dead when he gets the first cheque, they hope he will be before the next one is due.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LEAVENS: That is the attitude we take to our elderly citizens, that is the attitude which must be corrected in this and several other parliaments if our old folks are to live happy and contented lives in the ending of their days. The old emphasis of keeping down expenditures, which has brought the word "welfare" into disrepute, must be changed to a stress on social and human values.

Sometimes I think the Cabinet benches only think in terms of property values. Human values are entirely lost sight of. The sufferings of the old-page pensioner are not taken into consideration, and I want it understood that any remarks I make on the floor this afternoon do not refer to the Department of Welfare. I want to say every time I have approached the Department of Welfare for an adjustment on a welfare case, I have received courteous and prompt attention in the adjusting of these cases. However, there are only a few people who can get their cases before the Department of Welfare, only a few people who get in touch with their members in their riding and ask them to go to the Department of Welfare and adjust some difficulty.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, every case which is brought to the attention of the department is dealt with on its merits. We have a large staff working on cost-of-living bonuses all the time. It is being properly looked after.

MR. LEAVENS: I want to point out to the House it is not a question of merits or demerits. I sometimes challenge the reports of those who go to see the old-age pensioners, as to the condition they find these old-age pensioners in.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: I am not challenging the other part of it at all. I am saying these old folks, unless they do get in touch with their member of parliament or somebody else, have no advocate before the Welfare Department to plead their case.

I may say I received a very fine adjustment a few weeks ago, when an old lady of 78 years got in touch with me. She had had to move and here again I exonerate the Welfare Department, because she apparently had not got in touch with them. She had to move and went into a room where the rental was $7 a week without board—$7 a week rental on $30 old-age pension. Her neighbours and friends were feeding her. She approached me and I told her I would get in touch with the department, and I want to say inside one week she was receiving the $40 a month.

I want to say to the hon. Minister of Welfare, for whom I have a high regard—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: —that after this House rises I am going to make it a point to find out the name of every old-age pensioner and every one on mothers' allowance in my riding, and I am going to investigate these cases. I am not going to try to make a nuisance of myself, but where I think I should, I will be down, Mr. Minister, to your Department for an adjustment.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, I may say this goes for all hon. members of the House: We welcome having any of these cases brought to our attention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: May I continue, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to review for a few minutes who these aged people in our society are, and what they have done. We have just gone through a long war, and we were very fond of saying we were proud of the fact they have raised families who have lived to put on the King's uniform and go to battlefields of the world to fight for democracy.

At that time we extolled the virtues of fatherhood and motherhood and the fact they were ready to devote their sons to the cause of freedom. The old men and old ladies who today are 70 years of age were the fathers and mothers of the last generation. They have brought into the world a great many of those who fought in the last great war, who were prepared to go on the battlefields of the world to fight for a democracy which conservatism in the world had brought into bad repute—to fight for a democracy after a ten-year depression where 51 per cent. of our young men examined for military service, after that depression, were unable to fill the requirements for military service. That should be said to the shame of all governments, no matter at what level in the dominion.

These folks have reached the sunset of life. They too went through ten years of depression. Tens of thousands of those old folks lost everything they had in the breakdown of our economic order. In thousands of cases they would have reached old age with sufficient to maintain them, had the stability of our order not broken down at that time.

I do not think old age pensions should be put on a charity basis. I do not think the old folks should be made to feel they have got to plead for the right to live. I think it should be a pension, not a pauper's allowance.

When I heard the debate yesterday about the $2,000 increase to the cabinet ministers' salaries, and then thought of the old age pensioner having to live on $30 a month—

AN HON. MEMBER: A month.

MR. LEAVENS: Well, I will tell you it just does not make sense. I would like to see some of our cabinet ministers attempting to live on $30 a month. I would like to see that. It would be a spectacle to behold.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): It would be a nice slimming programme.

MR. FROST: It might have a good effect on you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: I have done very well since I came into this business.

MR. LEAVENS: I am pleading today for a just reward for the services rendered by our old folks. I should not have to plead. If this government had awakened to its responsibility to the old folks, in this budget they would have put sufficient to give $10 a month extra for all old folks in the Province of Ontario.

I think it is a bad commentary on government when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) announced, as he did a year ago, a $25,000,000 surplus, and at the same time only paid 2,000 old age pensioners at the rate of $40 a month. I do not think the people of Ontario want to save themselves taxes at the cost of the old folks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: All the Gallup Polls that have gone across Canada during the last two years have shown an amazing thing, not so much a preponderant vote of those approaching old age, or those in old age, but a preponderant vote of the young folks that the old age pension should be raised, and the age lowered.

I want to draw attention to one clause, a regulation in the Old Age Pension Act. I remember many years ago when the Parents' Maintenance Act was put on the books of this province, and it was for a specific purpose. Then as now, I suppose the aged old folks on the farm wanted to give up farming, and they deeded over the farms to the younger folks on the understanding they were to be kept the rest of their lives on the old home farm. A great many of the young people reached the point where they no longer wanted them in the home and put them in institutions. The Parents' Maintenance Act was passed specifically to stop that particular thing.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Leavens) a question?

MR. LEAVENS: Yes.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Leavens) made a speech in Orillia in 1943.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That old chestnut.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. A question is being asked.

MR. FROST: At that time he said this: The CCF would take over and socialize mining, timber and the natural resources—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Sit down, we have heard all about that.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Your Mr. Drew took that up in 1944 and got his answer.

MR. FROST: He continued—

MR. WISMER: You are doing this only for the press.

MR. FROST: He thought the CCF did not intend to control the land ultimately, the farmers could stay on the farms as long as they wished, but they could not will the property on their death to anyone else. The question is, is that still the policy of the hon. member (Mr. Leavens) and the party he represents?

MR. JOLLIFFE: You know the answer.

MR. LEAVENS: In reply to that, Mr. Speaker, I branded that as a lie in 1944. In this House when George Drew made that statement. I brand it as a lie now. I asked the paper to refute it. It was a lie then and still is a lie, no matter who says it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: I have at no time, in Orillia or elsewhere, Mr. Minister, ever made any such statement.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I accept the hon. member's (Mr. Leavens) word, but I am bound to say this, that the paper said the statement was true, and the hon. member—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is this a question?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am surprised at you.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): I am not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I say I do think—

MR. LEAVENS: I am not the least bit surprised, because the Conservative Party, the Tory machine, can only thrive on telling lies about other people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: I plead to this government for the old-age pensioners; to remove that maintenance clause which the individual faces as a regulation in the Old-Age Pension Act. It is a vicious means test that should be removed.

I would like the government benches to tell me how they enforce this Parents' Maintenance Act. I have inquired. The department will not enforce it. Parents must lay a charge against the child and bring him to the courts and get a judgment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. LEAVENS: That is what must be done, and you know it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What else could you do?

MR. LEAVENS: What would be the result? A parent would not do it. I would rather die on the doorstep tomorrow than issue a warrant on my child to come before the courts and maintain me in my old age.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. member (Mr. Leavens) if he would propose that the government should amend the Parents' Maintenance Act so we can force children in this province to support their parents?

MR. LEAVENS: Will you ask the question again, please?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Whether we should amend the Parents' Maintenance Act so the courts could force the child to maintain the parents? At the present time, the parent has to lay a charge against the child.

MR. LEAVENS: If the hon. Minister had waited a minute, I was going to elaborate on that. I do not believe children, except when they are living at home—and not too much then—should be forced to keep their parents in their old age. I am speaking from experience if I may be personal. In our family there were ten children, and my father reached 60 years of age and his health broke down. All we boys were married and had children of our own and our own homes and responsibilities, and we had an old age to think about, too. That was before the old-age pension came in.

MR. FROST: Did you not look after the old people?

MR. LEAVENS: We put in so much a month to keep the old folks, to the detriment of our own families because we could not afford it, but we did it. I say the old folks should be a direct charge on the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: They are nobody else's responsibility.

MR. FROST: Do you say the old people are no responsibility for the children at all?

MR. LEAVENS: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: He didn't say that.

MR. LEAVENS: I did not say—

MR. FROST: Yes, he did. That is what you said.

MR. LEAVENS: Listen to what I say. I say the government should accept

the full responsibility for old folks who are no longer able to work or maintain themselves. That is what I say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: That is exactly what I meant. As far as the Parents' Maintenance Act is concerned, all I am asking is that it be removed from the old-age pension regulations and put in a place where it was intended to be and should never have been taken from, because parents will not sue their children, and if they did it would only cause strife and bad feeling in the family circle. It would mean a break-up of the family relationship in many cases.

I ask the government, if they do not pay any attention to anything else I say, to remove this parents' maintenance test as a means test from the old-age pensions.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, there is no connection whatever between the Parents' Maintenance Act and The Old-Age Pension Act as laid down by the Federal Government.

MR. LEAVENS: You mean to tell me the Ontario Parents Maintenance Act is not a means test against the old-age pensioners?

MR. GOODFELLOW: That is right. It has nothing to do with the Old-Age Pension Act.

MR. LEAVENS: That is what I am trying to tell you. It is a means test.

MR. GOODFELLOW: We make no claim against the child.

MR. LEAVENS: The only claim you make is when your investigator is investigating, and if he finds the children are able to maintain the parents, you do not pay the old-age pension.

MR. FROST: No, you are quite wrong.

MR. LEAVENS: Oh, Mr. Speaker, do not let us quibble about this.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I knew of old-age pensioners in this province who have children who have incomes up to $20,000 or $25,000 a year.

MR. SALSBERG: They must be supporters of your government.

MR. LEAVENS: I would like to know some of them, too.

AN HON. MEMBER: They must support the government.

MR. FROST: Those are the people whom my friend would relieve from the pensions. Do you think the children should look after the old people at home?

MR. LEAVENS: Are you talking about old-age pensions as a pension or as a pauper's allowance? I say, Mr. Speaker, that every man and woman, millionaire or pauper, should be in receipt of that pension at the age set by statutory law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: We are in agreement with that.

MR. LEAVENS: Then why do you not do something about it?

MR. FROST: Why do you not speak to Mr. Coldwell about it?

MR. LEAVENS: I spoke about it here in 1944, and nobody has done anything as yet. Do not let us start "kidding" ourselves.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Does the hon. member (Mr. Leavens) suggest the province should come out with a straight pension across the board? Why, we would have such an influx of people—

MR. LEAVENS: There you go. Everything is "influx." Everything that requires the spending of money, you always say you will have a "influx" or something. It is so ridiculous, I am tired of listening to it.

MR. FROST: We have about half of Saskatchewan down here now.

MR. LEAVENS: I want to give a figure or two here to show you how backward Ontario is with regard to the old-age pensions payment.

In British Columbia—and there you have a coalition of the Liberals and the Conservatives; one cannot blame the other for anything that goes on—they pay $40 a month old-age pension; Alberta, $35 a month; and in the Province of Saskatchewan, which the government hates so much, it is $25, plus hospital services, which amounts to about $39 a month.

MR. FROST: It is $35 a month with a means test.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is the same as all the other means tests, and the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) knows it.

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then why speak as if it was unique?

MISS MACPHAIL: Oh, he just cannot help it.

THE SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: Here in Ontario we give $10 with a means test. Out there it is $5.

MR. LEAVENS: Mr. Speaker, do not let us be ridiculous. No matter what you give, whether it is $10, or what it is, you still do not give as much as Saskatchewan, because Saskatchewan has an aggregate with services of $39 a month paid to these old-age pensioners. Manitoba I understand has a bill now in its Legislature—and I think it was given second reading yesterday—providing for $35 a month.

But now, coming down to good old Ontario, the province in which I was born, the richest province in the Dominion of Canada, and I say you should hang your heads in shame over these social services. Coming down to this benighted Province of Ontario, under Tory rule, the best we can pay is $30 a month.

MR. FROST: Plus services, on top of that.

MR. LEAVENS: If you can show me—

MR. FROST: Nobody can show you anything.

MR. LEAVENS: Surely, the old-age pensioner, who is in need, should not have to go to the Department for assistance, under the present regulations.

I want to bring up the matter of our blind. I know you have done something for them. Reduced the age from 40 to 21, and it was a very fine gesture, for which I give the government credit.

MR. FROST: Thank goodness for that. We got credit at last.

MR. LEAVENS: But you stopped too soon.

MR. FROST: Oh, I thought so. There is a catch in it.

MR. LEAVENS. To those who are born blind, I think the most important years of their lives are from 16 to 21. The family allowances stop at 16, and you cut off the support for the blind for five years, from the age of 16 to 21. I happen to belong to one of the blind associations—

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Leavens) a question?

MR. JOLLIFFE: When did you come in?

MR. PORTER: Just in time to hear this.

MR. LEAVENS: Yes.

MR. PORTER: Has the hon. member (Mr. Leavens) any knowledge of the work that is being done at the school for the blind at Brantford?

MR. FROST: No, he does not know anything about it. He never heard of it. There is none so blind as those who will not see.

MISS MACPHAIL: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: I will give the orders for sitting down, please.

MISS MACPHAIL: All right.

MR. LEAVENS: I know all about the blind. I get the literature very often at home, and I read it all, and I go out and work amongst the blind, and I happened to be the delegate to the convention in Vancouver last year. So I want the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to know that I know something about the problems of the blind. I have never met anybody in the Canadian Federation for the Blind who was as blind as the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Apparently he knows nothing about it.

MR. FROST: He never heard of the place.

MR. LEAVENS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on, now that I have got wound up, on the question of mothers' allowances, but I think I will leave something for the time being, and I will be able to say a little more about them on the Estimates.

MR. FROST: Would it not be better if you went ahead now, and got it over with.

MR. LEAVENS: The pity of being a member of parliament and on the opposition benches is, as the hon. member for East York (Miss MacPhail) has said, just the ultimate of frustration. You speak to the Cabinet Ministers, and they get that smug, satisfied look on their faces, as if everything was "hunky-dory" in the Province of Ontario.

MR. PORTER: You have the frustrated look.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LEAVENS: If I were in the position before the public that you are, I would be the last to say anything.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then why are you not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LEAVENS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to close—

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAVENS: With a few verses written by a fellow countryman of yours, Mr. Speaker. If there is any group of people who drank the dregs, it is the Welsh miners in Wales. A Welsh miner sat in a mine one day, while eating his noonday lunch, and got a pencil and paper and wrote a very fine poem which aptly illustrates the struggle of the great working class in Wales and the struggles they have had to go through to maintain themselves down through the ages.

The poem is as follows:

"We have fed you all for a thousand years,
And you hail us still unfed,
Tho there's not a dollar of all your wealth,
But marks the workers dead,
We've done our best to give you rest,
And you lie on crimson wool,
If blood be the price of your cursed wealth,
Good God, we have paid it in full.

There's not a mine blows skyward,
But we're buried alive for you,
There's not a wreck drifts shoreward,
But we are its ghastly crew,
Go count our dead, by your forges red,
And the factories where we spin,
If blood be the price of your ill-gotten wealth,
Good God, we have paid it in full.

We've fed you all for a thousand years,
For that was our doom you know,
From the day you chained us in your fields,
To the strike of a week ago.
We've given our lives, and our babies and wives,
And we're told 'twas your lawful share,
If blood be the price of all your wealth,
Good God, we have bought it fair."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. S. GEMMELL (PC Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, as this is the first time I have spoken in this House, I hope you will pardon me if I do, at least, make some reference to the two gentlemen from northern Ontario who were elected as members of this House, but who unfortunately lost their lives before being permitted to sit in this House for the first time. I did not know either of them intimately, but I did know of their qualities, and I would like at this time to express my regret to the families of both Mr. Cragg and Mr. Carrere, in the great loss they have suffered. Northern Ontario at the same time suffered a loss, because these were young men, and they would have expressed the vibrant spirit of the north to this Chamber.

At the outset of my remarks, I would like for just a few moments to give a word picture of the riding from which I come. I imagine some of my hon. friends in the opposition benches will probably smell sulphur smoke off of my clothing, because they have listened to remarks regarding that for some time, but I want to assure the House I do not intend to devote my time to that subject.

As you know, Sudbury is the seventh largest city in Ontario, and is in the centre of the largest nickel development in the world. In the northern section, we have the timber business, the pulp and paper, and the tourist resources. I think every hon. member in this House would be much surprised if they came up to visit us, and I ask them to come up and see some of the lovely farms we have in the Blezard and Hanmer Valley.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And some of the best potatoes.

MR. GEMMELL: Yes. I see the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has been up there. Mr. Speaker, I think I will now reminisce a little—

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): And some of the worst corn.

MR. GEMMELL: There are sitting in this House four alumnae who graduated from the Sacred Halls of Victoria College. Unfortunately three of them are sitting on the opposition benches. I refer to the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott), the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer), and also to the hon. Leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

Several years ago—perhaps five or six or seven—I saw in a window of a law office in one of our buildings in Sudbury, "Harrison and Jolliffe," so I, therefore, assume that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) had come north to practise his profession. However, he did not stay long enough, I do not think, to really appreciate our fine qualities. It is possible the electoral climate of Southern Ontario was much more to his liking.

With reference to the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) and the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) I am reminded of the statement, "If a man is not a Socialist at 20 and a Conservative at 40, there is something radically wrong with him." I see some hope for the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott), but I think there are very dark days ahead for the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer).

I would like to refer to the debate on the Speech from the Throne, and a statement made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), in which he said: "We think that the Government of Ontario from 1943 to 1948 was conducted exactly as though it were a mere stepping stone to a higher office at Ottawa."

The record refuted that. If my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) had stayed longer in the north, he would not have been guilty of making such a statement. The north has a heart as big as gold, and with great warmth, and I would invite each and every member to visit us and see for yourselves.

I would suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that the capable, efficient and farseeing policy of the administration from 1943 to 1948, led by Colonel George Drew, and which was so ably displayed during that period, made it very obvious that he was the only man capable of giving Canada the leadership it deserves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GEMMELL: Northern Ontario at least recognized these abilities, and showed their appreciation, and their recognition by returning six Progressive-Conservatives in the last General Election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GEMMELL: George Drew, to my mind, captured the imagination of the north, and realized its possibilities, and that will be amply demonstrated in the forthcoming federal election, and no man in this country today has the courage and vision to give Canada the leadership it deserves, except Colonel George Drew.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GEMMELL: In speaking of Sudbury, in the first instance, I would like to refer to the city itself, in particular. We have 26 different racial groups. It has been my privilege and honour during my lifetime to have lived amongst the people of other races and other creeds, and I do consider that a great honour and a privilege. I would say that in that district, and in other districts in Northern Ontario, to live amongst people of different races, gives you a broader view and tends to make you believe and understand the ideas and outlooks of people of different races. In that way I believe the people of Sudbury, and in many other Northern Ontario areas, have made a great contribution to those of different races and creeds and by living with other races and other creeds, they have, indeed, all made a great contribution along that line.

I would like to make reference to a statement made in the House by two of the hon. members from the north. I may say I was very much perturbed to hear in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, two northern members on the opposition benches, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) and the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) speaking against the development of the Aguasabon project.

I would like to remind the hon. members that during the power shortage last fall, the only area in this province which did not suffer a shortage was the northwestern region. Not only did this development play a big part in settling that part of the province, but as a result of its construction, a new town grew up, which could not have been built for several years if any other policy had been followed.

Referring to the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Robinson), may I quote from a statement in the Fort William *Daily Times-Journal* of March 5th, 1949, in which he said:

> "Several people at the Lakehead remain puzzled by the unexpected attack on the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission in the Provincial Legislature this week launched by the member for Fort William, Charles Cox, and the member for Port Arthur, F. O. Robinson. Both criticized the Aguasabon power development at Terrace Bay. The Fort William member described the undertaking as a disastrous deal for the people of the Lakehead.
>
> "The curious feature of the attack on this particular hydro venture is its belated appearance. Both men may have had objections when the development was in the planning stage and when the Hydro Commissions of the Twin Cities were consulted. If they expressed them at that time, their protests were not particularly loud or long. Moreover, there is some mystery as to the authority behind the

attack in the Legislature. Certainly, neither the Fort William City Council, nor the Fort William Hydro Commission, nor the Fort William Liberal Association have egged Mr. Cox on. Nor does there appear to be any public body in the riding of Port Arthur which has prompted Mr. Robinson to speak.

Most of us will also agree that the establishment of a flourishing municipality such as Terrace Bay in any part of Thunder Bay is of great benefit to the Lakehead.

"A great deal of money earned at Terrace Bay is spent in Port Arthur and Fort William. Power being developed there in excess of the needs of the pulp mill—approximately 35,000 horsepower—has been made available to Schreiber, Nipigon and the rest of the Thunder Bay circuit.

"On the face of it, the undertaking appears to be an excellent deal for all people of Thunder Bay and northwestern Ontario."

May I refer to a similar statement from a different paper, the *Port Arthur News Chronicle,* and the *Fort William Daily Time-Journal,* which said in an editorial:

" 'Statements made by C. W. Cox, M.L.A., for Fort William, in the Ontario Legislature Wednesday to the effect that the Aguasabon hydro-electric power development was started without the whole-hearted approval of the Lakehead public utilities commissions, were entirely misleading and without foundation,' stated C. H. Moore, chairman of the Fort William Hydro-Electric Power Commission, today.

" 'After reviewing its advantages and disadvantages which were set out by A. W. H. Taber, local manager, and R. B. Chandler, Port Arthur Utilities manager, we decided to acquiesce. At no time was C. W. Cox, then an ex-officio member of the Port Arthur Commission, in attendance at these very important meetings,' he said.

"I believe that Mr. Cox is the least informed or most misinformed critic of hydro that I can possibly imagine.

"On many occasions the Fort William and Port Arthur Commissions held joint meetings on hydro questions and at no time was Mr. Cox in attendance. In addition, the Port Arthur Commission held many important meetings but he was always absent on these occasions."

Now, my point in bringing that subject to the attention of the hon. members of the House is not to discuss the particular issue which they discussed. I agree entirely with my colleague, the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. White), when he described it as "unadulterated nonsense." I say this is an attitude which displays a complete lack of understanding of the needs of northern Ontario, it is an attempt to destroy confidence in the Hydro Commission, which will mean the opening up of the great northern natural resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GEMMELL: What a comparison to the day when the Hon. Charles McCrae was sitting in this House. He was a champion of northern Ontario, and I cannot let this opportunity pass without paying tribute to Mr. McCrae, a man who gave the best years of his life to the public service, and especially was one who understood the north, and, as I say, was one of its greatest champions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GEMMELL: In the days when the Hon. Charles McCrae encouraged the buying of the Abitibi Canyon development, the position of that company went up until it reached a high level. I want to tell the hon. members of this House that if it had not been for the foresight of men like Hon. Charles McCrae, who believed in the northern country, none of the expansion which has taken place in the last 20 years would have been possible, and certainly none of it would have been

possible without the supply of power available in the gold belt or nickel-copper industry of the thirties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GEMMELL: However, having come from northern Ontario, and being the son of a pioneer, my roots are deeply imbedded in its soil, and I propose in the time at my disposal now, to try, in some way, to give a word picture of the country from which I come, and its possibilities.

I join with the other hon. members from northern Ontario, no matter on which side of the House they may be sitting, to bring to the attention of this House the great potentialities of the north.

I may point out that three-quarters of northern Ontario is contained in that part, and in that three-quarters, you will find 90 per cent. of the natural resources of this province. It has been stated that only 5 per cent. of the natural resources of this province have been developed. While this may not be wholly correct, it is a close enough approximation to explain what is in my mind.

I would like to go right into the heart of my theme by accepting a well-accepted fact that anything that benefits any particular area in the province will ultimately prove to be for the benefit of the whole. To illustrate my point, may I call attention to the fact—I think it was the Progressive Conservative Government saw in its wisdom the necessity or had the notion to construct a railway, now known as the Ontario Northland. I think I am safe in saying that railway represented an investment of $35,000,000. It runs up through the rich district of Timagami, through the clay belt all the way from North Bay to Moosonee. As a result of the foresight of the government of that day, we, in this province today have a great, widespread, industrious and vigorous community.

We have the large communities of Haileybury, New Liskeard, Englehart, Kirkland Lake, Timmins, Cochrane, Iroquois Falls, Noranda, and these towns represent developments of mining areas, agricultural areas and the pulp and paper industry.

This railway runs through the great clay belt of northern Ontario, which covers a great area of the Ontario Northland Railway, and, I think most of the members of the House are at least familiar with that. It is so important, I think, that the Legislature at one time realized that by establishing at Monteith an agricultural school. It was a wise investment because the carrying on of any agriculture in that part of the province is a difficult thing—in fact you cannot enter in all the activities of agriculture that you can in the southern part of Ontario, and people in the northern Ontario area appreciate the value of the experimental work carried on. Since the construction of the railway we now have construction of the highways. Now, it is a well-known fact that the Ontario Northland is a profitable railway, so profitable that even the two trans-continental railways would be very happy to get it under their wing. There are many areas of northern Ontario still undeveloped and it therefore seems to me, as I am sure it will appear to every honourable member, that any programme to develop these resources would result in large benefits to this province and to the dominion.

In order that we may see clearly the new tasks awaiting conquest of these areas, bulging with natural resources, let us, for the moment, examine the position of mining in the province.

You will agree, I am sure, that mining is the top industry in Canada. Last year it represented $800,000,000 in minerals produced. The mining activity in the Province of Ontario represented 35 per cent. of this total, or close to $300,000,000 in new wealth. Most of the mining activity in this province is carried on in northern Ontario, so that you can see it is an important factor in the life and growth of the country.

Coming from the riding of Sudbury, where our great nickel-copper industry

is centered, I might point out that activity here represents a very large portion of the mineral wealth of Ontario, and out of 34,000-and-some-odd people employed directly in the mines of this province, almost 14,000 of these are employed in the Sudbury area, or, in other words, over 40 per cent. The same is true of the amount of money paid out in wages in this industry, and also in the purchase of processed supplies. For example, our largest producer in the district would use each year 44,000,000 board-feet of lumber alone. The main point, I would like to emphasize, and leave with the House, is the challenging possibilities and unlimited opportunities for growth that exist up north for creating new communities and towns of a similar nature. One cannot live there without breathing an air of thrilling optimism and tremendous activity, for the place is alive with hope. The future is bright with promise.

The forward march of Canada is recognized by people of good will all over the world as one of the brightest and the most inspiring chapters in history. We are looking to the future with unbounding confidence. As a country we have just recently discovered we have a voice and we are beginning to use it. Let us use it wisely and well.

In passing may I say, none will question the place of gold in the life of any country, and I would remind you that the gold-mining industry is second in importance only to the nickel-copper industry of Sudbury. At one time the value of Ontario's gold production was greater than that of the nickel industry, but, unfortunately, gold is a product with a fixed price, that is, the price is arbitrarily set by governments, and therefore rising costs of production have so reduced the economical workability of some mines that production today stands at, roughly, 50 per cent. of peak years. I would say this, if it were not for gold it is doubtful if the Ontario Northland Railway could exist, and certainly there would be no Porcupine, no Kirkland Lake, no Geraldton, no Red Lake, or no Pickle Crow, with their thousands of people gainfully employed in the business of making Ontario the great, rich province that it is. The gold mines have really opened up the north and, if given a chance, they can roll back our northern frontiers and build new communities that will guarantee the continued prosperity of our province and of our country.

Next in importance to gold comes the iron-ore branch of the mining industry. Ontario can take pride in the fact that it is the sole producer of this highly strategical substance. Two mining operations are now in production. The Algoma ore properties with mines in the Michipicoten area, with the resulting steel mills at Sault Ste. Marie, and the Steep Rock iron mines in the Rainy River district. Vast deposits of iron ore are known to exist in this province and they are attractive in view of the fact of our geographical position in the centre of this continent, and the further advantage of the relatively close proximity to the Great Lakes Transportation System.

Let me suggest that this only tells part of the story, but it does help us to visualize what is to be expected in the years to come. Mining, in very many large and rich sections of our land, has just begun, and those who, 15, 10 and 5 years ago boasted that the surface of the Pre-Cambrian shield had hardly been scratched, have proven to be correct. Now, some of these days we are going to wake up and find great uranium deposits there. I am just bringing this into the picture to show you the great possibilities that are up there.

It might be interesting to know about the nickel-copper industry at Sudbury. I think the International Nickel Company is the greatest producer of copper in the world. It is surprising what does come out of those minerals. Nickel plays a very important part in international business. I believe 67 per cent. of the export goes into the United States, which brings very badly-needed dollars into this country, and also 27 per cent. is exchanged in England and elsewhere, for sterling, and most of the other products of this vast industry are exported, and that helps strengthen Canada's position. It is a different

picture from the days after the last war, when we had to shut down until new uses were found due, mostly, to scientific research. I believe nickel now enters into 75 different fields, and I would suggest to the House that the day of nickel alloy age has just begun, and the expansion that will take place assures to Sudbury, a great future. I think mining in Canada itself will gain much for the future of this country and certainly deserves every encouragement.

Now, we must say something about the lumbering industry as it affects the Province of Ontario. I am personally very proud of the policies that have been carried out by this administration. You see new towns going up as a result of their policy, towns being revived, well-equipped homes—I am thinking, particularly of the one near to my home, to Espanola. That has revived in the last few years as a result of government policy.

I can name some of the places which have developed as a result of that—the developments of Terrace Bay and Marathon, where formerly there was a wilderness. The pulp and paper industry is probably the greatest industry in Canada today. It provides, I believe, three out of every five newspaper pages used in the world each day. It is, therefore, natural to assume that that industry in northern Ontario ranks very high in our activity and the ramifications on southern Ontario and Canada, as a whole is immeasurable. The Government Management Clause makes certain that the companies live up to the terms of their agreement. I think we are assuring the people of Ontario a sound operation in perpetuity.

In the field of forest fire protection, I think the Ontario Government operates the largest fleet of aircraft in the world, used for this purpose. They do a great job helping people who are in trouble, "mercy flights" as you may call them.

Then, too, pretty well related to this problem, is the tourist industry. I would say mining, pulp and paper and the tourist industries are three of our major revenue-producing fields. I certainly would like to congratulate the government in forming in 1946 a Department of Travel and Publicity, which is now headed by the Hon. L. P. Cecile. Previous to that, it was in the very capable hands of the Hon. Mr. Welsh, who is now in Planning and Development. We have witnessed in the last three years the greatest tourist business ever. Anything I would say would be a word of encouragement to increase this department so that we can have more American tourists coming to this province.

While I am on the subject of the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Welsh), I would like to congratulate the government on that move. We have listened in the House for the last few days to the problems of planning and development for Toronto and its suburbs. I am sure, if the department functions as it has functioned in the past we, in the northern areas will avoid making the same mistakes through our period of development.

Also, in the Department of Lands and Forests trapping has become quite an industry. I think the returns last year were $7,000,000 to the trapper. The government has started a plan where each trapper is given an area of his own. He must look after this area and take care of it, and from that he derives considerable revenue. I think it is good that trappers all over the country will be assured a good revenue.

Then, too, I would like to make mention of the Forestry School at Dorset or Algonquin Park. I do not know how many hon. members know very much about that, but I know the University of Toronto Forestry faculty is taken up there for training. Also, our forest fire protection men are brought there for training. They also bring our scalers. It is a new thing, but it is certainly a good thing, and I hope they will increase the scope of this field.

Now, what I have been trying to get at throughout all my address is this—the northland is rich in resources, possesses unlimited opportunity. The people of the north are sturdy and strong, optimism is the dominant note.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GEMMELL: The Progressive-Conservative Government has made many wise and profitable investments there, and it has given constructive leadership. The people of the north showed their appreciation of that in the last election, as they will at the forthcoming federal election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GEMMELL: Let us go on. Let our alertness and foresight in the past carry through, and in this compelling hour seize every opportunity to explore these undeveloped resources and build a monument to ourselves and to ensure to generations yet unborn not only a greater Ontario but also a greater Canada. This is a problem not only for the party in power, but also for the other parties. May they give us their fullest support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, our next speaker will be the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox), and I would ask on his behalf that you call it 6 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6 of the clock, I do leave the Chair.

It being 6 of the clock the House took recess.

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1949.

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

AN HON. MEMBER: He (Mr. Calder) is gone.

AN HON. MEMBER: You could not hold him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (CCF Cochrane South): And now what are the Tories up to?

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate, there are two or three things I would like to talk about tonight.

I want again to talk briefly about the perhaps now famous Aguasabon development. I should like to say something about the hon. Attorney-General's Police and Firemen's Acts, and probably also something briefly as to what is now known as "the new salary grab."

In connection with the Aguasabon development, the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) asked some information about a week ago which I gave to him, confirming what I had already said about the protests which had been made about this at Port Arthur. I want to reiterate and repeat in effect what I said at that time, that I consider that undertaking most unsound. It was the illogical thing to do.

I want to say a word about the powers of the Hydro Electric and it might be well for this House to consider this: I think it is an extraordinary situation when the Hydro Electric officials can come into a municipality or into the north country and proceed with a development such as they did at the Aguasabon, at an ultimate cost of $15,000,000, notwithstanding what my hon. friend (Mr. Challies) says, and the official representatives of the municipality have not a word to say about it. In other words, they load us up with $15,000,000.

That undertaking was unjustified. It was primarily to facilitate the operation of a private company. I think we were all taken in, and might I suggest the promoters of that nefarious scheme were too smart for Mr. Drew, who consented to that job being proceeded with. It was not only to get power at the cost of the people of Ontario that they were thinking about, but they wanted an artificial lake created to facilitate the storage of their wood.

In fact, that whole, great, mammoth undertaking, the Long Lac, the Aguasabon development, the location of the mill, is a colossal tragedy as far as the people of Ontario are concerned, in my

opinion. I will perhaps go some time into the subject of the canal from Long Lac to Lake Superior, where the people's money was taken to divert traffic away from the people's railways.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Drew unwittingly or unknowingly consented to a deal whereby one of the main purposes was to create an artificial lake, and Lord knows, we have the largest fresh-water body in the world, Lake Superior, there without making another one.

The result is, this is a very, very expensive power project. The development has just had to build a tunnel between three and four thousand feet long and 15 feet in diameter, which will cost as much as a similar development on the Nipigon River. The ultimate result is the people in that part of northwestern Ontario will eventually have to pay a higher cost for power—they, the guarantors.

I am sorry I was not in the House prior to closing at six o'clock. I had an engagement down town. I understand my hon. friend—another hon. friend from the north (Mr. Gemmell)—was making some reference to the Aguasabon development. What he knows about the Aguasabon is beyond my comprehension because he is nearly 1,000 miles from it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. W. S. GEMMELL (PC Sudbury): You were not in any of the meetings; how do you know anything about it?

MR. COX: You listen to me and in the next five minutes if I do not convince you and your friends they are either fools or crazy, I will take them down to Florida.

AN HON. MEMBER: A nice trip.

AN HON. MEMBER: Reserve the tickets right away.

MR. COX: This gentleman here very kindly gave me a copy of what my hon. friend was supposed to have said. I may be permitted to read it:

> "Several people at the Lakehead remain puzzled by the unexpected attack on the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission in the Provincial Legislature that has been launched by the hon. C. W. Cox and the member for Port Arthur, Mr. F. O. Robinson—"

I see Mr. Robinson is here.

> "—both criticizing the Aguasabon power development. The Fort William member described the undertaking as disastrous for the people of the Lakehead."

I reiterate and repeat that.

> "The curious feature of the attack is that that was the first time it had been heard of. If they expressed any objection before, their protest was not particularly loud or long. Moreover, there was some mystery as to the authority behind the attack. Certainly neither the Fort William City Council nor the Fort William Hydro Commission nor the Fort William Liberal Association had egged Mr. Cox on."

When Mr. Cox is trying to right a wrong, he does not require anybody to "egg him on."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: I want now to read some more, and I will be interested to know where this extract came from, but I presume, and I suppose I may assume it is a reproduction from some one by the name of Mr. Moores of Fort William; am I correct? Might I assume that is correct?

MR. J. G. WHITE (PC Kenora): Mr. Speaker, the editorial he is reading is from the *Daily Times Journal,* the independent newspaper for Fort William.

MR. COX: I was asking this other gentleman (Mr. Gemmell). It was he who was talking.

MR. WHITE: You asked a question.

MR. COX: I am not asking you a question at all. The gentleman who was speaking—might I assume the article, am I correct it was supposedly written by a Mr. Moores, chairman of the Hydro-Electric; am I right in that?

MR. GEMMELL: Right.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker—

AN HON. MEMBER: What right have you to be getting up?

MR. WHITE: The hon. member is wrong.

MR. COX: I am not listening to you at all. I will sometime answer your silly remarks of about a week ago.

MR. WHITE: Not much more inane than yours at the present time.

MR. COX: Remarks of that character can only emanate from people who have not had much experience in the business world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Cox) a question?

MR. COX: No, it is not necessary. You will have plenty of opportunity. You talked for an hour the other day and said nothing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: I am going to read—and stop me if I am not correct—what purported to be an article written by a Mr. Moores. Mr. Moores is a very prominent Conservative of the Lakehead. He opposes me in every election.

> "Statements made by C. W. Cox, M.L.A. for Fort William, in the Ontario Legislature, Wednesday, to the effect the Aguasabon Electric Power Development was started without the whole-hearted approval of the Lakehead Public Utilities Commission. These statements were entirely misleading in that officials stated Mr. C. H. Moores, chairman of the Fort William Hydro-Electric Power Commission—

That is correct, is it?

MR. GEMMELL: Yes.

MR. COX:

> "—after reviewing its advantages and disadvantages which were set out by A. W. H. Taber, local manager and R. B. Chandler, Port Arthur Utilities manager, we decided to acquiesce."

And,

> "At no time was C. W. Cox, then an ex-officio member of the Port Arthur Commission, in attendance at these very important meetings.
>
> "I believe that Mr. Cox is the least informed or most misinformed critic of hydro that I can possibly imagine.
>
> "On many occasions the Fort William and Port Arthur Commission held joint meetings on hydro questions and at no time was Mr. Cox in attendance."

Is that correct?

MR. GEMMELL: Yes.

MR. COX: The gentleman who made that remark is either a fool or a liar, or both.

Now, I will tell you what actually transpired. Here is a copy of a local paper. In the most blazing kind of headlines possible, before the Aguasabon was started, and what are the words?

"AGUASABON PLANS OPPOSED"

This gentleman said nobody opposed it. This gentleman said I was never in attendance at any meeting. Now, I will read to you about the meetings. You will not listen to any of these Fort William Conservatives after you are through listening to this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: No wonder it is easy for me to be elected, with people like this around. This is a certified copy of a

meeting of the joint Port Arthur and Fort William Public Utilities, held in Port Arthur, a joint meeting.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (PC Minister without portfolio): What is the date? May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Cox) what the date is?

MR. COX: The date is December 28, 1945, before the Aguasabon started.

MR. CHALLIES: A year and four months before they finally agreed.

MR. COX: Before — they never agreed.

MR. CHALLIES: I beg your pardon?

MR. COX: They never agreed.

MR. CHALLIES: Well, I read you the minutes of where they did agree.

MR. COX: Wait till I read you this.

MR. CHALLIES: That is a year and two months before they finally agreed.

MR. COX: Yes, before it was started.

MR. CHALLIES: And the letter you presented here was a year and two months before they finally agreed to it.

MR. COX: What I am talking about is a joint meeting between the Port Arthur and the Fort William Public Utilities in connection with the Aguasabon.

MR. CHALLIES: Might I read just the last paragraph—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. COX: No.

MR. CHALLIES: Of the letter you presented? No, because you do not want it to come out.

MR. COX: I am talking about joint meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: One at a time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us take it as read.

MR. COX: They go on to say— J. R. Pattison, chairman:

"Whereas additional generating capacity is required to meet new industrial power loads and provide for the normal load growth in the District of Thunder Bay;

"And whereas the delegates from Port Arthur and Fort William Commissions who recently interviewed the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario in this regard have now reported to their respective commissions;

"And whereas the development of a power site on the Aguasabon River is projected for the immediate future."

Listen to this—

"Be it resolved, therefore, that this joint meeting of the commissions of Port Arthur and Fort William advise the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario that we are of the opinion that the needs of the Thunder Bay System could best be served by a development of Pine Portage on the Nipigon River and that sufficient power be made available on the Thunder Bay System lines at Alexander Landing for sale to Northern Ontario Properties who in turn could transmit and deliver to the proposed Kimberley-Clark mill the required power;

"Furthermore, that if conditions developed requiring that power be made available before the Pine Portage project could be completed to deliver sufficient power for the immediate need then the power requirements should be met by the installation of additional capactiy at either or both of the existing Nipigon generating stations;"

That was a resolution in plain, unmistakable language.

MR. CHALLIES: 12 months before they decided and agreed to—

MR. COX: Months before if you like, but—

MR. CHALLIES: 14 months.

AN HON MEMBER: Make it 18.

MR. COX: Months before, in plain, unmistakable language, after visiting Toronto—

MR. CHALLIES: You ought to bring yourself up to date. That is the trouble.

MR. COX: You will not be up to date when I get through.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (CCF Cochrane South): He never was.

MR. COX: In unmistakable terms. After visiting Toronto, the Port Arthur and Fort William commissions had a meeting and advised against going ahead with the Aguasabon.

MR. CHALLIES: They agreed 14 months afterwards.

MR. COX: Just a minute. This is the amazing part of it. This gentleman, according to what my hon. friend for Sudbury (Mr. Gemmell) said, "Cox never attended a meeting. If he made any protests they were not loud or long." Here was a meeting between the two public utilities, passing a resolution on to the Hydro Electric against the Aguasabon. Now, who do you think moved that resolution? Who do you think moved it, advising against the Nipigon River—or the Aguasabon development?

It is Mr. Moore. The very man you were talking about today who condemned it. The very man whom this gentleman for Sudbury (Mr. Gemmell) comes into this House and read that I never attended a meeting. The implication is that he was always against the Aguasabon. He himself moved a resolution advising against the Aguasabon. Can you imagine anything like that?

MR. FROST: What changed him over?

MR. COX: What changed him over? The Conservatives. Politics. That was a political scheme from the beginning to end.

MR. O. S. VILLENEUVE (PC Glengarry): You sound alike.

MR. COX: The mayor of Port Arthur seconded the resolution—C. W. Cox—and he said I was not there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: Here is the resolution. Now, you say I did not speak "loud and long"? What am I supposed to do to let the people know—shoot somebody?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX:

> "Mayor C. W. Cox of Port Arthur this morning termed the Aguasabon project 'fantastically uneconomical.'"

That is what I said about it. What more could I say?

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): They were fighting words.

MR. COX: I seconded the revolution—resolution—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER: Revolution?

MR. MacLEOD: Revolution?

AN HON. MEMBER: I think he had better move his seat.

MR. COX: I used the strongest possible language in condemning it, and this gentleman has the temerity to repeat what somebody else said, indicating I was never there and never said anything about it. I will ask my hon. friend, the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson), who sat with me on the council, if it is not true there was hardly a council meeting in the city of Port Arthur the last five years at which I did not condemn the Aguasabon development?

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): We have discussed it a lot of times.

MR. COX: Sure we have. I can believe him, and you cannot believe Moore.

MR. CHALLIES: He was not very emphatic.

MR. COX: The Aguasabon was another of the infamous deals of the north, and there have been many.

It was a calculated scheme to facilitate the development of a private company. Nothing more, nothing less.

MR. FROST: May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Cox) a question?

MR. COX: Anybody can ask me a question.

MR. FROST: All right. I would like to ask the hon. member this: This Aguasabon development is part, as I understand it, of the Thunder Bay district, is it not—the power district?

MR. COX: That is right.

MR. FROST: Might I ask my hon. friend this: He has condemned this development and says it is uneconomical; would he like it taken out of the Thunder Bay power district? Would he like it removed out of the district and put into Northern Ontario Properties?

MR. COX: May I answer that this way?

MR. FROST: I would like an answer. Do you want it done? If you say so, we will do it, if you want it out.

MR. COX: The interpretation of your question—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: What you said was rather ambiguous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give him an answer.

MR. COX: I understood you wanted an answer from me as to whether we wanted the power dam moved out of the district? That is impossible.

MR. FROST: Oh no, it is not.

MR. COX: If you asked me, I would want that power development on the northern Ontario system.

MR. FROST: Yes?

MR. COX: My answer is, yes, it should have been in northern Ontario.

MR. KENNEDY: Would that suit the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson)?

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): I have not the power in this House to make that decision. I will consult the authorities, and if they approve it—

MR. FROST: What do you think yourself?

MR. ROBINSON: Off the record, I think it is a feasible thing.

MR. KENNEDY: That is all we want to know.

AN HON. MEMBER: You got that fixed up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. KENNEDY: We try to please.

MR. COX: If you can fix the timber deals as well as that, you will fix the north up.

I have a report, a copy of a report made by the two engineers at the Head of the Lakes and that is exactly what they suggested. Here is a report signed by two engineers.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without portfolio): What is the date?

MR. COX: It is dated in 1945.

MR. CHALLIES: December, 1945?

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. CHALLIES: Now, go ahead.

MR. COX: Thank you very much. These were qualified, eminent engineers.

> "We are of the viewpoint that should the construction of a power plant of the Aguasabon River be obligatory, then this project should be built and operated solely by Northern Ontario Properties."

That is what the engineers wanted, and that is what I want.

MR. CHALLIES: Would the hon. member (Mr. Cox) read the rest of it? It is only about ten lines.

MR. COX: That is the only paragraph which has anything to do with it.

MR. CHALLIES: Read the rest of it.

MR. COX: We will be here all night if we do.

MR. CHALLIES: You are afraid to read the rest of it.

MR. COX: Anyone who has been elected 25 times is not afraid of anything.

MR. NIXON: You never saw anything like this before.

MR. COX: I had a little opposition before, but not much here now.

MR. CHALLIES: Just read the rest of the report.

MR. COX:

"We believe that the present day is the most opportune time to proceed with the Pine Portage development, having in mind the system load growth definitely available now."

MR. CHALLIES: Read the last paragraph.

MR. COX:

"We submit this report as the considered opinion of the writers and would suggest that the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario engineers be requested to check over our diagrams in as much as they have more complete information than is at present at our disposal."

MR. CHALLIES: At our disposal.

MR. COX: "At present."

MR. CHALLIES: And 14 months afterwards when they got that information, they agreed to the Aguasabon. That is the whole story.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOHNSTON (PC Parry Sound): May I ask a question? Is it not true that around December 10, 1946, a delegation came down and agreed to the Aguasabon development and went back to Port Arthur and reversed their decision? Then, some months later, they agreed. I just want to point out that the original decision made around December 10, 1945, was in favour of the Aguasabon. Then, having returned, around the 16th of December, they reversed their decision.

MR. CHALLIES: No.

MR. JOHNSTON: That is right? I think if you are—

MR. CHALLIES: May I answer that question?

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Who is making the speech?

MR. COX: It is up to him.

MR. CHALLIES: The answer is in the negative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHALLIES: In December, 1945, the Hydro Commission discussed Aguasabon with your engineers who checked our diagrams and data, inasmuch as we thought the commission of Fort William and Port Arthur did not have as much information as we had, as the Board of City Engineers asked us to do. I read in the House in January, 1947, both of these commissions approved finally the Aguasabon.

MR. JOHNSTON: I might just say a word. I can prove my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid the House is getting hopelessly out of order. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) has the floor.

MR. JOHNSTON: the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) challenged my question.

MR. SPEAKER: I suggest that, if the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) has finished, then some questions may be asked. We are getting hopelessly mixed up now.

MR. JOHNSTON: I can prove I am right.

MR. COX: I am not surprised that my good friend, Mr. Robinson (Port Arthur), gets up to protest, because irrespective of what my transitory friend says—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHALLIES: He is in honest business anyway, and that cannot refer to you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (CCF Cochrane South): Make him take that back.

MR. COX: I do not know where the question of veracity comes into this at all, but as far as business ability between you and myself, would anyone doubt?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: I am not questioning your veracity, I am stating facts. Now, if you suggest that that Commission acquiesced without political pressure, why, I give you credit for not knowing as much as I thought you did. There were only two or three people meeting with the Hydro Electric officials in Toronto, from the Head of the Lakes. Mr. Chandler has been manager for years of the Port Arthur Public Utilities. He is a very eminent engineer, associated with the Hon. C. D. Howe in some of the largest undertakings on the North and South American continents. Who could you get with hydro experience? Mr. Taber occupied a similar position in Fort William. You who understand the legal situation have protested strongly against this nefarious deal. They object to it as I object to it, but there was not any use. Mr. Moore, a well-known, fine Conservative, was a party to this nefarious deal. This nefarious deal was made to suit a private company against the wishes of the people of the north.

MR. KENNEDY: We will take it out if you want.

MR. COX: The damage is pretty well done.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (CCF Hamilton East): Will you take the pulp mill out, too? Just before—

MR. COX: If it had been done correctly, that mill would have been where it should have been, not in its present location.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. COX: Any place, the whole thing is wrong. Millions of dollars were spent on a canal diverting the water away from the railway, off the ordinary course. Leaving it in its natural course, $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 would have accrued in years to come to the Canadian National Railway by diverting the traffic over that run. The whole scheme is wrong from the point of view of the people of Ontario. It was a political scheme in the first place. You are undoing it to a certain degree, some of the things which should not have been done. You are not rectifying the conditions putting a mill there, which only partially manufactures. The mill does not, by any means, put out a finished product. All the main work is carried out in the States. What do Canadians get out of that? Finally, it will be of some gratification to know it will be lifted off the backs of the people of the Lakehead, I am sure they will agree to that.

I think I have proved to your satisfaction that Mr. Moore, that prominent man of the Lakehead, does not know what he is talking about. That is an undisputable fact.

Now, I want to say something about the police and firemen. I am sorry the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is not here. I am not without experience in municipal affairs and some experience

in this House. I have not all the details of this Act in my head as I have only read it once. I want to say, in a general way, that I do not think the government is one that should set an example as to how a municipality should be managed. I think, on the contrary, the record of the municipalities and the liquidation of their debts is better than the Province of Ontario. Let me tell you what the implications will be. I understand they are going to exercise some degree of control over the police and firemen, which I think is wrong. The result will be that when we are setting our budget for the police or firemen, the natural tendency will be, "what difference does it make, what does it matter what it cost, the government is going to assume a part of the cost anyway." The result is that we are going to have one extravagant department in the city and that being so the rest will follow suit. The result will be, there is going to be a higher cost for the municipalities in the Province of Ontario.

I do not think the government should interfere in municipal affairs, I do not think they should have anything to do with that department. If the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) were here, I would ask him: "Why stop at the police and firemen, why not take over the Board of Health or the Board of Education, why just take one department and seize that and leave the rest to the municipalities?"

Now, a little bit about the increase in the salaries grab. I am surprised that was done, giving some of our friends across the front benches some extra money. I do not think it is very good business and, from my own experience in public life, it is not even good politics. It will not look very well when I go back home and tell people about it when we are over the big rush and there is a lot of unemployment—3,000 at the Lakehead. I do not think they will like to hear that someone is getting $3,000 a year more. I do not think these 3,000 people out of work would like to hear about it. We cannot give the old-age pensioners in this province a measly $10 a month more but we do not mind adding $3,000 more to the salary of our friends in the front benches. I think I know some municipal representatives who are being thrown out of their positions because their salaries had been increased without consulting the municipality. I think if you had been fair, you would have told them before the election, not afterwards. That was the time to talk about the increase. I disagree entirely with that move.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like again to repeat that the Aguasabon deal was not signed for the people of northwestern Ontario. It was put through primarily to assist a private company at the needless expense of the public. I entirely disagree with our Police and Firemen's Act, that a municipality should be left to conduct its affairs and the province should look after theirs.

The Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is not doing a very bad job where he is; let him stay there, but never mind municipal affairs.

I rather disagree with the principle of paying $3,000 a year on salaries without in the first place taking the people into their confidence.

I thank you.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, it had not been my intention to participate in this debate. However, a number of things have been said by the hon. members opposite and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) which seem to require clarification and some amplification, at least.

I am sorry the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is not in his seat; I would like to address some remarks particularly to him and reply to some of the things that he said. I am afraid the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) got a little excited soon after opening his remarks in the debate. I have the preliminary draft copy of *Hansard* and I find that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) soon got off the track on what he was saying regarding education and got into a rather more or less political debate in which he charged that the hon. members on this side of the House, in this particular

group, had won their election chiefly through Communist support. That is in *Hansard.*

I would like to say to any hon. members opposite who might share that idea, that if they really want to know the secret of why there were so many Conservatives left at home and so many CCF-ers gained seats in the last election, they had better look at some of the returns, and particularly High Park and similar ridings where the Conservative votes failed by thousands. In High Park, the hon. Premier lost by 6,000 over the number of votes he received in 1945.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): The Ex-Premier.

MR. MILLARD: Yes, the Ex-Premier. The same applied to other hon. members, particularly in the City of Toronto and other urban centres. I think even the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) who, I believe, had the largest vote in the Conservative ranks, lost a considerable number of thousands of votes in the last election. In other words, there was a great decline.

If the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is suggesting that these 6,000 votes that Mr. Drew lost in High Park are the result of Communists turning their support over to the CCF, then he is welcome to take that responsibility in calling the good people of High Park "Communists or Communist supporters," but that is where the votes came from to help elect the hon. member from High Park (Mr. Temple).

I also just want to indicate that I feel it is a rather touchy subject for the hon. member for St. George (Mr. Porter) to raise, particularly at this time. I do not think there is an hon. member in this House, with respect to the number of votes received in support, where the source of that support is so much in question at the moment as the hon. member for St. George (Mr. Porter).

HON. MR. FROST (Treasurer): 2,700 majority, that is what the Judges found. There is no question about it at all.

MR. MILLARD: Now I would like to turn my attention to the Royal Commission on Education. I notice the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) made quite a spirited defence of the length of time being taken by the Royal Commission on Education. I would like to refer the hon. members to *Hansard,* starting at page 211 for this session, and I would like to read for the hon. members, one of the portions of the letter written by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to the Chairman of the Commission (Mr. Justice Hope). I note in a second letter from the Commissioner (Mr. Hope), or the Chairman, to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that it was he that pointed out the fact the commission has not been so long, in comparison to some of the commissions that have been seated on this question in Britain. I notice the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) read that into the record here Tuesday evening.

I would like to suggest there is something pretty strange going on regarding this commission. I would like to read two or three letters in correspondence that I had on this matter, after I have brought to the attention of the House the following paragraph from the letter written by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) in the first part of the letter. You will recall, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) said, "Following my recent appointment to this office, my first concern was to enquire as to the progress of the Royal Commission on Education and the possibility of a report being submitted in the near future."

I can understand that, Mr. Speaker, because it was reported and not denied in this House, in the Throne Speech Debate by one of the hon. members in the Liberal group, that the Chairman of the Royal Commission on Education made a statement in 1947 that the commission report would be out that year.

Then, I have the clippings here of the statement made by the hon. Premier and the Minister of Education of that day (Mr. Drew) in the last election campaign at the head of the lakes, in which he said the report would be out

last year. That statement is on record; I will be glad to put it before the House, if you so desire.

Then, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) in concluding his letter to the chairman had this to say:

> "Undoubtedly the magnitude of the task of this commission, which has carried on its hearings under your chairmanship, was not fully anticipated at the outset. It would therefore be folly to make undue haste towards the completion of a report, and therefore the best interests of the province will be served by the fullest possible deliberation."

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): That is right.

MR. MILLARD: That is a clear invitation, "Take your time, boys, take your time." That is exactly what you are saying. I would like to point out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that he had already discussed this matter privately with the chairman of the commission.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: Why the need of confirming it and putting it on record?

HON. MR. PORTER: We like to have it on record. We have nothing to hide. Otherwise, there would be all sorts of suspicions. There are no suspicions now.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): What about the hog subsidy? There is no record of that.

MR. MILLARD: On July 12th, as a member-elect of the Legislative Assembly, I wrote to Dr. R. W. B. Jackson, at the office of the commission, 206 Huron Street, Toronto, as follows:

> "Dear Sir: There is, as you are probably aware, a good deal of speculation as to what will be contained in the Hope Commission Report and when it will appear. There are some rumours to the effect that the report has already been made to the Lieutenant-Governor and to the government, although it has not been made public. At any rate, it is awaited with a great deal of widespread interest.
>
> "As secretary of the commission, would you be good enough to let me have a schedule showing the number of meetings held by the commission, the dates of the first and last meetings and a list of persons or organizations which submitted briefs?
>
> "I should also appreciate any information you can give me as to where copies of the submissions can be obtained and whether there is to be a compilation of the briefs, either separately or forming part of the report.
>
> "Thanking you for your early attention, I am, Yours sincerely, C. H. Millard, M.P.P."

July 16th, I received the following letter from Dr. Jackson:

> "Dear Sir: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 12th submitting enquiries with reference to the work and report of The Royal Commission on Education in Ontario. Under ordinary circumstances, your letter, addressed to me as secretary, would have been referred immediately to the chairman, The Hon. Mr. Justice John A. Hope, and subsequently brought to the attention of the commission. At the present time, Mr. Justice Hope is on holiday; you may be assured, however, that upon his return your letter will be brought to his attention. At that time he may wish to discuss the questions with you personally, and would undoubtedly at any time welcome a visit from you as evidence of your continuing interest in the matter. If there is any urgency, however, I shall on your request be pleased to forward your letter to him. In the meantime, I am sure the chairman would wish me to inform you that the various rumours to which you have made reference are without foundation that the commission is pursuing its labours, and that the work will continue until the duty assigned to it, which you will understand and

appreciate is of the greatest importance, has been fully and adequately discharged."

Then, because of a stenographic error, there is no date on the letter to which my attention was drawn by the Hon. Minister (Mr. Porter). At a later date I wrote to the Deputy Minister of Education, Mr. F. S. Rutherford, as follows:

"Dear Sir: As you are probably aware, there is considerable public speculation regarding the contents of the Hope Commission Report and what would seem to be a delay in its publication."

HON. MR. FROST: What date is that letter?

MR. MILLARD: I say it is undated by a stenographic error.

HON. MR. FROST: Before or after the reply from the secretary?

MR. MILLARD: I believe it was written the same day as Dr. Jackson's.

"As a member of the Legislative Assembly and as one of those who presented a brief to the commission, I am particularly interested in the report and its publication. I would, therefore, appreciate any information you could give me concerning this matter."

Well, I got the usual type of reply from a deputy minister:

"The Royal Commission on Education has not yet submitted its report. I am therefore unable to inform you of the probable date of its publication, or of its contents, as these are matters entirely under the control of the members of that commission."

HON. MR. PORTER: You are not criticising that?

HON. MR. FROST: That is pretty obvious.

MR. MILLARD: That is the kind of reply I got from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) also.

HON. MR. FROST: What do you want, a hit and run report? Why don't you wait until these distinguished gentlemen are ready?

MR. MILLARD: Then I wrote to Dr. Jackson again on October 25th—that is getting close to the time when the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) assumed office.

HON. MR. PORTER: I was in office then.

MR. MILLARD:

"Dear Sir: On July 12th I wrote to you asking three things about the work of the commission. The first was, in substance, whether the commission had reported and, if it had not, when we might expect a report. The second was a specified request for the number of meetings held by the commission, the dates of the first and last meetings, and a list of persons or organizations which submitted briefs. The third request was for any information you could give as to where copies of the submissions could be obtained and whether there is to be a compilation of the briefs, either separately or as part of the report."

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, what I was after was to try and get submissions so we would know what was before the commission in order that we might be prepared to deal more effectively with the report when it was given.

HON. MR. FROST: We have given you a pretty full time.

HON. MR. PORTER: They have taken three years: I do not know how long you would take.

MR. MILLARD:

"On July 16th you acknowledged receipt of my letter, stating that the chairman, Mr. Justice Hope, was then on vacation and that, upon his return, my letter would be brought to his attention.

"More than three months have elapsed since I received your reply,

but I have not heard from Chairman Hope or from you in regard to the questions I asked.

"In a matter of such public importance I believe the commission should now be in a position to indicate when it expects to complete its work and whether or not it intends to issue an interim report on certain phases of its work with recommendations.

"I should greatly appreciate it if you would again bring my enquiries to the attention of Mr. Justice Hope and would give me the information for which I asked previously.

"I was pleased to learn that the rumours to which I referred on July 12th were without foundation, and I thank you for your prompt reply to this part of my enquiry."

Then on October 25th, the same day, I addressed a letter to the Hon. Dana Porter, Minister of Education, Parliament Buildings, Toronto, Ontario:

"Dear Mr. Porter: Since the portfolio of education is one of the most important within the Cabinet, may I take this opportunity of extending my congratulations on your recent appointment to this post.

"For more than three months I have been attempting to obtain some information as to when the people of this province may expect a report from the Royal Commission on Education.

"I am sure you will agree that the terms of reference set forth in the appointment of the commission were of very great importance and were among the most sweeping ever given to a Royal Commission.

"It does seem to me and to a number of my colleagues in the opposition that, after more than three and one-half years, the commission should be in a position at least to indicate when a report would be made and whether or not an interim report with some recommendations for urgently-needed reforms would be forthcoming in the near future.

"I wrote the Deputy Minister of Education and the Secretary of the commission in mid-July, but received no reply to the enquiries I made.

"Thanking you for your early attention, I am, yours sincerely."

That was October 25th, then the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) replying on Oct. 28th:

"Dear Mr. Millard. I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 25th instant. I am informed that you wrote to the Deputy Minister of Education an undated letter which was received on July 8th, and a reply was sent to you under the signature of the Acting Deputy Minister at that time, dated July 17th. The information contained in that letter still applies to the situation at the present time."

That is a lot of satisfaction. Then I wrote another letter, or rather, I had a letter from Mr. Justice Hope.

MR. PORTER: You should "Come up and see me sometime."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: I had this letter from the chairman of the commission—I finally got a letter from the chairman. It says:

"Dear Mr. Millard:

"The Secretary of the Royal Commission on Education has referred to me, as chairman, your letter of October 25th as he had earlier referred your letter of July 16th.

"In his reply to your first letter, the secretary gave you what seemed to be the chief information which you sought, namely, confirmation or otherwise of a report which you had received from some source, that the commission had already completed and submitted the report, and the secretary also suggested that I would welcome a visit from you if you wished to discuss any other phase of the work of the commission with me. Not having heard from you in the interim, I

assumed, (apparently wrongly) that the information given to you by the secretary sufficed for the time being.

"In replying to your present letter, I am somewhat at a loss. I fully appreciate your interest as a member of the Legislature in the activities of all public bodies, and also the fact that no doubt you have a certain right to information through the usual channels relating thereto. But it has always been my opinion that a Royal Commission reported only to the source of its appointment, namely, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

"Without violating these accepted principles, I will be very happy to have you call upon me at my Chambers at a time to be arranged to our mutual satisfaction, when I may be able to assist you with some of the information you seek."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Chairman of the Commission agreeing with his position that he should report to those from whom he had received the appointment, and said to him that:

"Dear Mr. Justice Hope:

"In the press recently I have noted several references to the commission. One of the commissioners, Mr. Charles Conquergood, was reported, on October 28th, as hinting that 'the report of the Royal Commission might alter the whole salary picture.' Also, Dr. Goldring has indicated that the report of the commission will not be made until after the next session of the Legislature.

"May I say that I find myself largely in agreement with you regarding the responsibility of a commission to report 'only to the source of its appointment.' In our parliamentary system I believe the same principle applies in the case of an elected representative.

"I trust you will agree with me that it is bad in principle and in practice to have the commission's progress shrouded in mystery as far as the public is concerned, with the exception of hints by some members or their political friends, while those of us who serve in elective positions are unable to report to those to whom we are responsible, namely the people of the Province of Ontario.

"I thank you for your very courteous and prompt reply to my letter of October 25th and for your readiness to arrange a meeting in your chambers. I shall be out of town for the next two weeks, until November 29th, but I should appreciate it if you would indicate a convenient time and date in the first week of December for such a discussion."

Apparently that "convenient time" has not arrived, as I have not heard from the chairman of the commission since that time.

Now, the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is this; it seems to me we are entitled, as members of this Legislature, on a matter of such grave and profound importance as this problem, to have more definite information than we have as yet received.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: What sort of information. Not the contents of the report, which is coming out about the middle of the year.

MR. MILLARD: In order to get—

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I point out that it took 20 years to make a report on a similar wide reference in England.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It was not similar.

MR. PORTER: It did not go as far.

MR. FROST: It did take them 20 years over there.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) by saying that if all of a sudden you have found there is a precedent in Great Britain, why did not the chairman of this commission, who said the report would be out in 1947, know that at that time? Why did not the hon. Leader of the Progressive- Conservative Party (Mr. Drew) in the

recent election campaign tell us that it would take a good many years? He said it would be out last year. It is in the record.

MR. PORTER: May I remind the hon member (Mr. Millard) of this, and I am sure he is seeking information in this matter; this commission has had 200 briefs presented to it—

MR. MILLARD: Why could you not have told me that long ago?

MR. PORTER: Surely the hon. member (Mr. Millard) can visualize the magnitude of the task in dealing with 200 briefs from different organizations, representing all phases of this problem.

MR. JOLLIFFE: How long did the Rowell Commission take? Two and one-half years.

MR. PORTER: That was a long time.

MR. FROST: I may say when the report was made, nobody agreed with it. You want to get a report you will agree with, do you not?

MR. NIXON: Mr. Bracken agreed with that report.

MR. PORTER: Did he?

MR. NIXON: Absolutely. Did he not tell you about it?

MR. FROST: "Mitch" (Mr. Hepburn) did not.

MR. NIXON: No, certainly not.

MR. MILLARD: Just another 11 days, and it will be the 4th birthday of the Royal Commission. We should celebrate it. We should send the hon. Chairman some roses, four nice, big, bloomers.

MR. PORTER: That would be very acceptable.

MR. MILLARD: I think we find the answer to the riddle in the Estimates this year. I would like to point out to the hon. members, that in 1945-46 we spent on the Royal Commission, according to the Public Accounts of 1946, $30,710.75. In 1946-47, we appropriated, according to the Public Accounts, $55,000 and spent $48,037.76. In 1947-48 we appropriated $51,000, and, according to the Public Accounts of 1948, we spent $46,736.03.

However, Mr. Speaker, I find that the Estimates for 1948-49, under the heading "Royal Commission; to be voted" the sum of $65,000, made up as follows—and this is last year:

Counsel fee, $10,000.
Honoraria, $16,000.
Office Equipment, $2,000.
Salaries, $26,000.
Travelling Expenses, $9,000.
Miscellaneous, $2,000.

Now, the riddle, as I say, clears itself in the Estimates this year. We were told, according to *Hansard,* by the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that he expected to have the report by the middle of this year. That is on the record. But while last year we made an estimate of $65,000, in the Estimates this year, we have the item, item 13, vote 36, for $93,000, which has been appropriated. If there was a large item in there for the printing of the report, which will undoubtedly be prepared, I would have felt that in some parts, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) was correct.

MR. MACLEOD: That is the way the lawyers earn the $8,000 a year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: This is made up as follows:

Counsel fees, $2,000.
Honoraria, $42,000.
Office Equipment and Supplies, $3,000.
Salaries, $28,000.
Travelling Expenses, $6,000.
Miscellaneous, $12,000.

You will notice there is a drop of $8,000 in the counsel fees.

MR. PORTER: That shows they do not expect to sit very long this year.

MR. FROST: We are cutting the lawyers off.

MR. MILLARD: If they cut the lawyers off, the people who get the honoraria are doing all right. Last year the honoraria were $16,000, and this year they are $42,000.

MR. SALSBERG: They are getting older. It is the old-age pension.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: Last year we only spent $2,000 for office equipment, and this year it is $3,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Perhaps it is for filing cabinets.

MISS MACPHAIL: My remarks evidently brought results.

MR. PORTER: That is the result of the speech made by the hon. member for East York (Miss MacPhail).

MR. MILLARD: Last year the salaries were only $26,000, and this year they are up to $28,000. I am glad they are getting more on the payroll, or that the pay of those who are on the payroll is being increased.

Last year the miscellaneous was $2,000, and this year it is up to $12,000.

I do not know who "miscellaneous" is, or what it is for, but that is what the estimate calls for. I say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), that that is a clear provision for at least another full year's work at a greatly increased expenditure over last year.

MR. PORTER: What is the number of that item?

MR. MILLARD: That is item 13, vote 36, in the Minister of Education's estimates.

MR. MACLEOD: Give him the page, too.

MR. FROST: Shall the item carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: I may clear the mind of the hon. member (Mr. Millard) on this, Mr. Speaker. In view of the reduction in some of these items, it would indicate that the sittings appear to be drawing to a close, and the "miscellaneous" will cover the printing of the report, so I think the hon. member may expect something pretty soon.

MR. MILLARD: Do you think $12,000 will cover the printing of that report?

MR. PORTER: It would get it well under way.

MR. MILLARD: I doubt it. Why have the "honoraria" gone up?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I can explain that. I can say quite frankly and fully what is the intention. The members of this commission have been sitting and paid $10 a day and some travelling expenses, and it is proposed to give each one of those members of the commission an additional honoraria, which has not been settled yet, perhaps, but something, in view of the work they have done. Surely the hon. member (Mr. Millard) will not criticize us for doing that.

MR. FROST: There are some 20 members on that commission.

MR. MILLARD: Yes, I have the list here.

MR. FROST: When these figures are taken this way, it gives one impression, but in view of the fact they are investigating a department which is now spending $50,000,000 a year, do you think in view of the importance of this, and the spending of $50,000,000 a year, that these figures for a commission of, I think, either 20 or 23 representative citizens across Ontario, are out of line?

MR. PORTER: I may remind the hon. member (Mr. Millard) that he himself has emphasized again and again the importance of the work of this commission, and the very vital importance of the report he hopes they bring out, and which I predict they will bring out.

MR. FROST: I cannot understand why my friend wants a sort of a "shotgun report," on a matter of such importance.

MR. MILLARD: That is a little bit of syrup, because it was the chairman who looked into this case and heard all these briefs and statements and said we would have the report out this year, and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Drew) last year said, before the election, "It will be out this year," and when the present hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) took office he also was concerned regarding the delay, so evidently nobody had thought, from the Treasury benches, it was going to take all this time, and so they enquired about it. But I am convinced. That if we have no federal election until next fall, we will not get the report until after that election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: My friend should not think in terms of politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: In order to bring this thing to a head, I want to challenge the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter)—

MR. FROST: Oh, I thought the hon. member (Mr. Millard) was going to move something.

MR. MILLARD: I want to challenge the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to table in this Legislature all the grants given to the public and separate schools in 1947 and 1948, and the dates they were given, and put them on the table here in this Legislature, so we can see what is going on. There was about $37,000,000 of our money spent in this province—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there will be the slightest difficulty about doing that. I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Millard) of this, that the grants given to school boards throughout this province have been carried out strictly according to the regulations, and I would be only too glad to table them. I believe it may take a little time to get all these figures together, and get them before the House, but we have nothing whatsoever to hide in the disposition of school grants to all the schools throughout this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: I am very, very glad to have the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) assurance of that.

MR. PORTER: Then you will not be living on rumours any more.

MR. MILLARD: That will be fine.

MR. FROST: Would my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) like to go down and look at the book himself?

MR. MILLARD: No, this is public business, where they are spending millions of dollars. Let us see if they are handed out equitably.

I made the statement in this Legislature that we should have a system which would give equal opportunity. I cited glaring cases of inequality, of unequal opportunities. Yet we have the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) standing up this afternoon and saying "we are doing fine." There was a great insult given to the people of this province—

MR. PORTER: You cannot unravel all these difficulties at once. There are a number of difficulties, and you cannot unravel them all at one time.

MR. FROST: Look how well we did since we have started, and we did not have to make any report, and you are criticizing the Hope Commission for taking maybe five years to make a report.

MR. PORTER: During the last five years there has been no under-the-table grants given by this government at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: I want to say a word about this question of delay. I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that he did not have to have a Royal Commission to do certain things.

MR. FROST: We have done them, though.

MR. MILLARD: Then why a Royal Commission?

MR. FROST: We wanted to have one.

MR. MILLARD: To make adjustments—

MR. PORTER: We have not made them all, but we have made many adjustments from year to year.

MR. MILLARD: Then I suggest you are stumbling along in the dark. You say, on the one hand, you need this Royal Commission, and then you say, on the other hand, you have been making adjustments.

MR. SALSBERG: And Toronto is not paid 50 per cent.

MR. PORTER: I am not sure but what Toronto is getting too much.

MR. SALSBERG: You are not—

MR. PORTER: You are getting $3,500,000 every year, and have been getting it since these grants started.

MR. SALSBERG: And we spent about $17,000,000.

MR. FROST: You would have had to spend $20,000,000 without the grants.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) has the floor.

MR. MILLARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I notice the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) does sometimes speak out of turn. I have a newspaper clipping here from the *Toronto Daily Star*—

MR. PORTER: You will not hold that against me, will you?

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are awfully worried tonight.

MR. MILLARD: You are not worried now?

MR. PORTER: No. I am proud of it. Go ahead.

MR. MILLARD: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is reported to have said:

> "I envy the Toronto board of education in making itself popular by raising salaries indefinitely—and not having to provide the money."
>
> . . . . .
>
> "I am glad to see the board is able to do all this and get away with it. The people seem to like it."

Well, then, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is reported in tonight's *Star* as saying:

> "Mr. Porter earlier said in his address that appearing before them was 'the most terrifying experience I've had yet.' He said he had 'put his foot into it when I addressed some Toronto secondary school teachers several days ago. Since then I have found I was entirely wrong on almost everything'."
>
> . . . . .
>
> "Following the discussion period, Mr. Porter said: 'I think we are going to be in a position to change some of the regulations which have been criticized'."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: That is all right.

MR. SALSBERG: Do not back up.

MR. PORTER: It is a very simple explanation, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) is very careful. I was addressing a meeting of teachers of English, and it was the most terrifying experience any politician has to go through.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can say that again.

MR. PORTER: I pointed out to them I had been speaking to a group of teachers a few nights before, at which I made a few suggestions as to how they could teach, and they found I was not quite right about that, and I thought I had said too much. And I told these other teachers about this experience, and admitted that perhaps I had been wrong, because in talking to technical people, one has to be careful, but, on the other hand, we had to talk when we are invited to.

Surely, if the hon. member (Mr. Millard) brings up a matter like this—after all, no doubt I was wrong. I am not a teacher of English; I do not know anything about teaching English, but nevertheless, when I spoke to the teachers of English, and gave my own views as to what they might do, just to give them something to think about and talk about, and, if they wished, to take a crack at me—

MR. MILLARD: Then surely you will not mind if I do the same thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: No, I do not mind it a bit. I like it.

MR. MILLARD: Then at the conclusion of this astounding address by the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), following the discussion, Mr. Porter said:

> "I think we are going to be in a position to change some of the regulations which have been criticized."

I would like to know if the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is not in a position to change these regulations, which you say you are going to be in a position to change—

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: The question is: are you going to change them?

MR. PORTER: This happened last night. The people present were teachers of English and some professors in the university, and very learned people, and I was at a great disadvantage.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You have our sympathy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you tell them anything to think about?

MR. PORTER: Well, apparently I gave them something to talk about. They had a very full discussion which was very useful to me, about some of the problems of teachers of English in our secondary schools, and in the university and it appears there was certain matters that could be changed as far as the department regulations and control are concerned, and I was very happy indeed to have the benefit of that discussion with these teachers last night and when I am quoted as saying, "I am about to be able to change the regulations," the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is quite right. We are in the position to change any regulation of this department at any time, and have changed them and will change them when the needs of the case arise and as they arise.

MR. MILLARD: I hope you know more about the report than we do.

MR. PORTER: I do not know anything about the Royal Commission Report. I have been very careful not to know what is in them.

MR. MACLEOD: The experience of last night helped you a bit because you were much better than you were last night.

MR. PORTER: Well, it was a very rarified atmosphere last night, quite different to this Legislature.

MR. MILLARD: Then this afternoon the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) raised the question about my failure to use the latest report, and said that he would dispute the statements I had made or the point I was trying to make, so I would just like to clarify the record by putting in all the figures instead of just the average figures which the hon.

Minister (Mr. Porter) gave us this afternoon. This is from the hon. Minister's own report of 1947.

MR. PORTER: That is a year ago.

MR. MILLARD: You said 1946, 1947, '48. So the median salary—

MR. PORTER: What is the median salary?

MR. MILLARD: The median salary is for all public school teachers in all the different communities throughout the Province of Ontario—$1,723.

MR. PORTER: What is median?

MR. MILLARD: That is the middle one, as many above as below. That is what "median" means. We have here the Minister's report and surely he understands it.

MR. PORTER: Of course, I was not the Minister when that was written.

MR. MILLARD: Well, you will have to get used to it next year. The median salary given for all public school teachers in Ontario is $1,723. Now, it may be slightly up this year, as the Minister reported this afternoon, but my point is still valid. What I said was: how do we expect the kind of teachers we need if we are paying less money by far—$500 less than unskilled labour in steel mills—to our teachers? That does not mean the unskilled labourers are getting enough. They are not getting enough. Here is last year's—

MR. PORTER: May I just say this to the hon. member (Mr. Millard); most of the steel mills of this province are concentrated in the City of Hamilton.

MR. MILLARD: No, Sault Ste. Marie, and—

MR. PORTER: The City of Hamilton has a greater variety of steel mills than any other city in Ontario, and the City of Hamilton is a high-wage area, even for unskilled men, compared with a great many of the smaller towns.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about Windsor?

MR. PORTER: Well, of course, I am talking about steel mills, and I am going to have here in just a moment some of the figures we have of salaries in the City of Hamilton, and I think if the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is going to compare salaries of school teachers with salaries in steel mills, I think it would be well to compare the same salaries in—

MR. MILLARD: Well, you will have to take in Port Colborne and Welland and Kitchener, and you will have to take in the automobile industry.

MR. PORTER: It is not a steel mill. You said "unskilled labour in steel mills."

MR. MILLARD: Well, let us say "labour."

MR. F. S. THOMAS (PC Elgin): I ask the hon. member (Mr. Millard) if you are going to compare, then you would have to give us the comparative hourly rate. Teachers teach 10 months.

MR. MILLARD: They have to eat for 12 months. Do you want to get the teachers to go out and work for the 2 months?

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, they do.

MR. MILLARD: To go out and work and do that instead of coming back to the university for refresher courses. I would like to go on.

MR. THOMAS: I would like an answer to my question.

MR. MILLARD: I could give you the hourly rate, it runs from 90c to $1.10.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Would the hon. member know how many hours a teacher puts in in preparing his lessons, reading his papers?

MR. PORTER: I am not suggesting that the teachers have reached an ultimate in salaries.

MR. THOMAS: If you are going to

compare wages across the board, I would like my wages compared with the farmer.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about having it in comparison with the Cabinet?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I have here before me a summary of the salaries of the public school teachers in Hamilton, and I think it is quite fair, when the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is finished about the steel wages as compared with teachers' wages, that a fair comparison would be with the salaries that prevail in the City of Hamilton.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What about Port Colborne?

MR. PORTER: I have not Port Colborne here.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, that would not be handy at all. That would destroy your argument.

MR. PORTER: Let us deal with Hamilton.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us have order.

MR. MILLARD: If the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) does not mind, if he would just hold his fire and put them on the record afterwards—

MR. PORTER: I will do—

MR. FROST: You have been asking for this, here is the information.

MR. MILLARD: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) had all afternoon to put it on the record.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) brought up the question of steel-workers, and what I have suggested is, it would be fair to compare average salaries of teachers in the City of Hamilton, where the greater part of the steel industry is centered.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) did not ask the Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) a question.

If the Minister is going to interrupt the member for West York every time he thinks he has been hit we are going to be here a long time.

MR. MILLARD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have another thing which I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members opposite—and I believe it is constructive and I believe it is long overdue. If the members will go back to what I tried to say in the Throne Speech the other day, what is happening to thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of our young people in this province who have to leave school or do leave school between 14 and 16 years of age, where there are apparently no appropriate courses to fit their needs, as pointed out by Dr. Goldring? I think that the hon. members will agree that there is a tragic situation developing in this province. I ask every hon. member opposite to earnestly consider what I am going to say. I have here —I do not know whether the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is aware of it, or not—I have here in my hand "Education for Industrial Purposes," report of John Sneath, Superintendent of Education, dated 1910. The government of that day, a Conservative government under the leadership of Premier Whitney, I believe, was so impressed with what was going on in the educational system of that time, that he caused the Minister of Education in the government to appoint John Sneath to make a full enquiry.

Now, I am not going to burden the hon. members with what is in this book. I have read a considerable portion of it.

But John Sneath went to Great Britain, just as the hon. Minister—or at least, the director of education, Mr. Althouse, the chairman of the board, and Dr. Goldring went two or three years ago.

MR. PORTER: What is the date of the book?

MR. MILLARD: 1910.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Before you were minister.

MR. MILLARD: This is dated, "Superintendent of Education, John Sneath, Ontario Department of Education, December, 1910." Now, Mr. Speaker, this report recommended that for industrial education in this province we should establish a system of vocational schools, a system of technical institutes, a system of trade schools, co-operative schools and art schools. There is a very full description of the investigation that was made. It did not need a Royal Commission in 1945 to inquire into this matter; this matter had already been inquired into very fully.

In the year following this report, the federal authorities established a Royal Commission on Industrial Education. I have several of the volumes of the report here. That commission did not sit over four years, but it did go over the ground and issued a very voluminous report as to the findings and the need in this country, in this province and across the country, for industrial education.

It is rather strange that even after we have a Royal Commission, even after we get a report and recommendations from experts in the field—this was a man appointed because of his knowledge of education, he was the superintendent of education for the province, and he made a report and recommendations to the government of the day—the government passed an Act in 1911 and they provided for the establishment of trade schools, technical institutes, vocational schools, art schools and so on, but up until the present day—I will ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to correct me if I am wrong—not a single, solitary trade school as recommended in this report has been established in this province.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Just like the Ross report.

MR. MILLARD: During that 38 years, the Conservatives have been in power in this province for more than 26 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): And we will be here for 26 years more, too.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) is entirely wrong.

MR. KENNEDY: As usual.

MR. PORTER: It was on the basis of this report the whole vocational school system in this province has been based. Surely the hon. member (Mr. Millard) knows something of the great system of vocational schools we have, and in the last few years we have been entering on many new types of experiments in the way of technical institutes and trade schools of one kind and another, but that report was merely a report.

There may be some aspects of it that have not been acted upon, but mainly our whole vocational system followed the recommendations in that report.

MR. MILLARD: In the *Globe and Mail,* January 28, 1949, director C. C. Goldring—Dr. Goldring whom I quoted at length the other day—made a recommendation that a two-year technical school course be instituted for students leaving school at 16, and if the hon. Minister will read this recommendation, he will find it is not the classical technical school that was developed over the last number of years. I read the report of the hon. Minister in 1945. It pointed out that out of 100 children starting school in this province, approximately 60 per cent. did not get through the first form in high school, only 13 out of 100 got through the last form in high school, and only four of them went on for higher education at the university.

That means thousands and thousands of our youth are going out of our schools unprepared. They are not prepared for industrial life, they are not prepared as well-equipped citizens, they are certainly not prepared to take their place in a thorough-going democracy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MR. MILLARD: What I am saying is true, Mr. Minister. Up to the present time you have not established a single,

solitary trade school as recommended in this report, not one in this province. Now, this was designed to try to meet the problem, so if you take the last 38 years you will find we have been turning out of our schools, or dumping out before they were completed, a lot of people that just have not had the opportunity of getting the type of education they required, both on the cultural side and on the technical and trade side.

The time has now arrived when we should undertake a thorough-going programme on this line, and I would like to point out to the hon. Minister in case he has not read his reports on this matter yet, that you have practically nothing provided except the private trade schools. It is quite true you have had a Trade School Department, you have a man who goes out and polices them to keep racketeering down in private trade and technical schools.

MR. PORTER: We have the Ryerson Institute.

MR. MILLARD: Yes, lately acquired.

MR. PORTER: Yes, and carried out by this government.

MR. MILLARD: Quite true, but I say what that is, is only a flea-bite compared to the need.

MR. PORTER: Well, you have got to begin.

MR. MILLARD: All right. Dr. Goldring says: "We have experimental classes of 144 pupils—"

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, the department has already indicated its willingness to approve of the Toronto proposals as to a trade school, which the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is referring to.

MR. MILLARD: I am sorry, I did not catch what the hon. Minister said.

MR. PORTER: The department has already given its approval to the proposals the hon. member mentioned of Dr. Goldring. We have already approved of that proposal.

MR. MILLARD: But, Mr. Speaker, that is the point I am trying to raise before this House. These proposals were made 38 years ago, and we are just getting around to them now. What has happened in the meantime?

MR. FROST: This government is doing it.

MR. MILLARD: Then this government, or its predecessor, and your party, were in power, I say, 26 years out of the 38.

MR. FROST: Oh well—

MR. MILLARD: What were you doing all the time?

MR. FROST: What about the Grits, your next-door neighbours there?

MR. MILLARD: I am not asking them, I am asking you.

MR. FROST: The answer is, we were not in before. Now we are here, and it has been done.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I want to show the emphasis put on it even now. The hon. Minister gets a note from his deputy, I presume, and says: "We have given approval." I will tell you what hapened; this proposal came before the Board of Education of the City of Toronto and the answer was: "We have not enough accommodation," so it is off, we do not know when it will take place even in the City of Toronto, so that is the extent of the programme for trade school education. Mr. Speaker, I am not complaining—

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no?

MR. FROST: What are you doing?

MR. MILLARD: —and I hope every hon. member opposite will realize, I am not complaining about the amount of money spent for the farmers. Maybe we should spend more to help our farmers, but I want you in the course of this Debate and in consideration of the Estimates to compare what we are trying to do to educate people in the rural areas and what we are trying to do to educate those in the industrial areas of

the province, and you will find we are failing miserably in the industrial areas to bring to our people the type of education which is required to help them to reach a decent and full and satisfactory life in this province.

I say that so far as the Ryerson Institute is concerned, it might be all right, but it is only a flea-bite as to the need, and no provision has been made in the Estimates for anything approaching a programme suggested in this report made 38 years ago.

MR. PORTER: The Ryerson Institute takes care of all the applicants that they receive. All the people who want to go to it so far have been able to go.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In Toronto.

MR. MILLARD: I said I was going to say something about trade schools and now the hon. Minister has raised the question, I will admit you have a department, stuck around a corner downstairs in the Department of Education, pretty hard to find it, but you will find it if you really search for it. They have a little 2 x 4 office down there, two little desks stuck in a cubbyhole, and an inspector who is out of his office most of the time to police the trade school business. So far as private trade schools are concerned, in the early part of last year, Mr. Minister, your report shows that 20,000 people in the Province of Ontario were not getting the type of schooling they needed in the public or secondary school system, and they went out to try to buy supplementary education.

They spent at least $4,000,000 in this province last year, through correspondence schools and all kinds of trade schools. You had to have a policeman watching to see they were up to grade and so on.

MR. PORTER: Just an inspector, just as we have in our public schools. Does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) suggest the trade schools he mentioned are not doing a good job? Does he suggest that?

MR. MILLARD: If the hon. Minister—

MR. PORTER: What is wrong with them?

MR. MILLARD: If the hon. Minister will read his own report of 1939, he will find that the registrar of trade schools pointed out they had to disqualify approximately half or more—

MR. FROST: That is all right, but they did not disqualify the others.

MR. MILLARD: I am saying they had, at that time, anyway, racketeers in this education, who took advantage of a number of people—

MR. FROST: They did not succeed very long. That is another thing this government cleaned up.

MR. MILLARD: That was in 1939.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): You have not done anything since but coast.

MR. MILLARD: Correct, nothing but carry on the work that was started at that time. I have, I think, said enough about trade schools, but certainly that is one of the great lacks in this province. Our people are not getting the type of training they need. They are leaving school for one reason or another before they are 16, or as soon as they are 16; technical training is not what they need, being fitted out to go to university is not what they need.

Dr. Goldring said they are not dunces, they are not low in I.Q., maybe not as low as some of the rest of us. But they need some training, where they are going to get some cultural education and some technical and trade education at the same time.

We are turning people out of our technical schools who, when they go into a steel plant, are told by the employer: "You will have to start at the bottom, your training is of no use to you, it makes no difference. You will have to learn the business from the bottom." We are not turning out bricklayers, we are not turning out carpenters, or skilled mechanics, and even the government

knows those were the types of people you were trying to get over here on the air immigration plan, because they were trained in Great Britain. We were short of those people here in this country, and you wanted to get them out here.

MR. FROST: But is it not true in Great Britain they have been trained actually in industrial conditions?

MR. MILLARD: Yes, they have been trained partly in industry, but I believe a combination system of training is what we really need. We need two or three years in school with some academic training, or cultural training, along with it, and finishing off maybe on the actual job. I want to assure hon. members opposite if the government will give the lead they ought in these things, I am quite sure organized labour will co-operate 100 per cent. at their end.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: I say to the hon. member (Mr. Millard) that we have given this lead. Now, as the hon. member says, at the moment it has not reached the large proportions which he would like ultimately to see, but we have experimented in this type of trade school and have expanded in this direction and we hope as time goes on we will be able to expand it more as we gain experience.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, that again is so unsatisfactory. What about a bricklayer you want trained at the Ryerson Institute, Toronto? How do you know he is not born in Sault Ste. Marie?

MR. PORTER: We cannot have one in every town, all at once.

MR. MILLARD: If it takes this long to get started in Toronto, Lord help us as far as the rest of the province is concerned.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) does not realize the length of time it takes to get a new institute like this under way.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, we got the technical institute going, but we did not get the trade schools that are recommended here in this report. Why pick out one and not the other? Dr. Goldring says it is trade schools we need and he is an expert on education, not me.

MR. PORTER: There are lots of experts like the English teachers.

MR. MILLARD: Is the hon. Minister suggesting Dr. Goldring is not an expert?

MR. PORTER: No, I say there are lots of experts.

MR. NIXON: Very cautious.

MR. PORTER: Good ones, too.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister this afternoon addressed himself to this question of higher education. Frankly, I am not qualified to speak about higher education. About the only time I have been in university is when I have been an invited guest. In the course of my remarks on the Throne Speech Debate I mentioned this question of higher education and an article which appeared in the paper. I would like to put two paragraphs of this particular article on record, because it seems to me to high-light the fact that here again we are missing the boat. We hand over huge sums to universities. We do not take into consideration the question of the ability of those people who have the mental qualifications to go forward, to go there.

I asked the hon. Minister this afternoon a question about bursaries. I am glad there is likely to be a thousand bursaries or scholarships of some type sponsored by this government and the Federal Government jointly this year. I am very happy to know that, but I say even a thousand in the Province of Ontario is again far, far short of what the situation requires in regard to assisting those who have the mental ability but do not have the financial ability to pay the fees which are required at the present time.

MR. PORTER: Vastly more than it was four years ago, vastly.

MR. MILLARD: I am not saying it is not more. I am prepared to give the government full credit, but I am saying it is not enough for what we need at the present time.

MR. PORTER: Well, nothing is ever enough.

MR. MILLARD: What I am saying is, you are handing money over to the directors and governors of the university to do this job, and I do not think you are meeting the situation by just handing over money. I would like to point out that we are losing here in Canada some of our best qualified professors in our universities. We are training them but they cannot get any place because they are in the highest paid university, possibly, in Canada when they are in the University of Toronto or McGill. When they get up there, the only way they can get more money is to become the head of a department some place else, and the result is they go down to the United States where they can get more money.

Here is the situation, and I do not think this particular, recognized, international magazine would be putting in an irresponsible article. They are trying to tell us as legislators and others what the situation is in our universities.

MR. PORTER: What paper is that? What magazine?

MR. MILLARD: *Collier's.*

MR. PORTER: Who wrote the article?

MR. MILLARD: The article is by "An Anonymous Ph.D."

MR. FROST: Oh. About our university?

MR. MILLARD: About universities he had known.

MR. FROST: Universities anywhere?

MR. MILLARD: I say our professors are leaving and going over to the States.

MR. PORTER: I get anonymous letters every day. We would rather know who wrote the article.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, now, just a minute.

MR. MILLARD: I think this magazine can be counted on not to take an irresponsible article that has not been investigated.

MR. PORTER: How do we know?

AN HON. MEMBER: What difference does it make?

MR. MILLARD: It starts out: "How do you feel today—"

MR. FROST: Fine.

MR. MILLARD: "—nice and calm and satisfied?"

MR. FROST: We can answer that.

MR. MILLARD: It says: "Read this and feel your blood begin to boil."

MR. FROST: Is this the Ph.D.?

MR. MILLARD: This is a starving professor, underpaid until he nearly starved.

MR. FROST: We haven't anything like that around here.

MR. MILLARD: "Under an educational system neglected and grown weak from a new generation that has suffered economic loss and will make a generation suffer with it unless something is done very soon."

One of the things I have noticed in this House, Mr. Speaker, and one of the things I noticed about the budget when it was introduced, was the smug, complacent, budget—everything is swell, we have done a great job, there is nothing wrong.

MR. PORTER: We did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: I stood here and told the government two or three times, I am quite prepared to give you full credit for what has been done. I think

you go a little beyond that when you take credit for things you could not very well help doing under the abnormal circumstances, and the buoyant finances we have had.

MR. PORTER: We do not boast very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Not as much as you do. What you are going to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Read *Hansard* tomorrow.

MR. FROST: We have to pat ourselves on the back a little. You give us no credit at all.

MR. MILLARD: I am giving you lots of credit.

MR. FROST: No, he is reading from an American magazine, somebody starved to death in the States and he is trying to blame us for it. We want to know who wrote the article, and he does not know who he is.

MR. SALSBERG: You do not need any credit. You have the cash.

MR. MILLARD: All I am trying to say, Mr. Minister, if this is the situation in the States, and our professors are going over there, it must be much worse here.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many?

MR. MILLARD:

> "My humiliation as a college teacher was complete when the bank turned down my request for a $500 loan. 'Sorry,' an official said, 'on your present salary—' he meant I would be a poor risk, a poorer risk than a truck driver, a skilled mechanic or an electrician."

Getting back again, to what I said about the question of teachers' salaries, high school teachers' salaries, I have the figure here for secondary school teachers and it is still below the labour rate in these places for the Province of Ontario.

> "And he was right—"

That is, the banker—

> "$500 was about as much as I would make in two month's work as an assistant professor at one of the leading colleges of the United States. Walking home across the handsomely landscaped campus ground, I bitterly reviewed the facts of my economic life. After six years of preparation for my career and six years practising it—12 years of adult life, I was still unable to support my family. We had lived, yes, squeezing by on the fringe of genteel poverty and my wife was going to have a second baby and we had not quite finished three years later, paying for the first. Our situation had become intolerable. I was sore and I think I had a right to be. I was also typical.
>
> "When I reached home, I told Anne the bank had refused the loan; her lips tightened. 'I know you have always had your heart set on teaching and research,' she said, 'but now we have the children to think of. Circumstances are against you, professor, that is all'."

MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) know whether the professor was any good?

MR. SALSBERG: Sounds like a "red" anyway.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is like asking if a minister is any good.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Welfare): Would you allow me to tell a story, when you mention a minister? A minister came down from the west to our part of the country.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I was talking about cabinet ministers.

MR. DUNBAR: And he was telling about getting $1,000—

AN HON. MEMBER: $2,000.

MR. MILLARD: Is the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs back?

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, yes, always here. And he was getting $1,000 in Saskatchewan for preaching and the

gentleman said: "Don't you think that is rather small for preaching?" "But," he said, "you have not heard the preaching." That is to the case here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Look out, George, there will be another riot.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a joke?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes. I was here before you were, and I will be here after you go out. You are a fly-by-night, you just keep the seat warm and we will defeat you again.

MR. MILLARD: Was that addressed to me?

MR. DUNBAR: That is addressed to you. You should take it all and do not get high blood pressure.

MR. MACLEOD: That is pretty good from a fly-by-day.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks. I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite are tired of listening to my talk.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are right there.

MR. MILLARD: I have tried to be constructive and place before the government the fact that all is not well in our education system, it is far from well. Simply by dumping more money into it and simply going on without the advantage of this report—I honestly believe it is being delayed for political purposes. I am convinced of that, because if the job was going to be over by the middle of this year, I do not think we would have prepared a full year's estimate for the commission, which we have done. I believe it is being delayed. I believe sincerely what I have said regarding the teachers.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) does not suggest the report is being delayed by any action of the government, does he?

AN HON. MEMBER: "Inaction."

AN HON. MEMBER: By the High Command.

MR. PORTER: Or by instructions of the government to the commission to delay the report?

MR. MILLARD: I do suggest—

MR. PORTER: Because if the hon. member suggests any such thing, I tell him right now that is not so. It is not so.

MR. MILLARD: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, as did the quotation I gave here tonight, that the hon. Minister issued an open invitation for the commission to slow down—

MR. PORTER: No, no.

MR. FROST: No.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. KENNEDY: I would like to say we are trying to get the report out as quickly as possible.

MR. MILLARD: Well, I think if the hon. Minister had said that to the chairman of the commission—we are anxious to get this report as quickly as the commission.

MR. PORTER: But we are going to have a proper report.

MR. MILLARD: And I would like to know from the hon. Minister, is it not true—does the hon. Minister deny he has got two men from his department working full time on this report, and they have been for the last year?

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: They are working on it?

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: They ought to let you know—

MR. PORTER: I do not ask them. Because they have been on the commission, I have been very careful not to ask what is going on in the meetings of that commission. This is a commission.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker—

MR. PORTER: I do not want such suggestions made.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, cannot the Ministry or the Cabinet, in a matter so important, at least get the parts of the report that are finished and let us deal with the recommendations contained with respect to those matters? Why do we have to wait for the completed article?

MR. PORTER: We do not want a hit-and-run, half baked business. We want to know the whole picture. That is the only advantage of the commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: After the election.

MR. F. S. THOMAS (PC Elgin): Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the hon. member (Mr. Millard)? This goes back a few moments, but I am particularly interested.

I am not clear on this point, you made a reference which left an inference in relation to many students for agricultural education as compared with that spent on education for those engaged in industry. I would be very happy if you would clarify that. Personally, I do not think there is any discrimination, but you left that inference.

MR. MILLARD: No, I did not say there was discrimination. I said I fully agree that possibly we were not even spending enough to qualify our farmers and give them help and educational opportunity in colleges and so on.

We have colleges for farmers—I think the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) knows that—and we are spending a great deal of money for that purpose. There is no corresponding school for workers to train them for their particular vocation. That is the point I was trying to make.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): Might I say, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the hon. member (Mr. Millard), I agree there are colleges, but I might point out that I, who had the privilege of attending that college, had to pay my fees and pay my way, and I did it, if you will pardon the personal reference, by earning $170 a year as a hired man for a period of 12 months. Those opportunities still exist for farm boys, and they are still doing it that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: Well, I would like to say to the hon. member opposite (Mr. Thomas, Elgin) that to go out to learn a trade is a different matter, and they spend far more than $170 to learn a trade.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): I did not say—

MR. MILLARD: What I am saying is this, when they leave school too early, they do not have their educational opportunities rounded out by being able to get some cultural education along with their trade training, and we are losing out. We are losing out also regarding the apprenticeship system. The employers are not taking on the apprentices, or if they take them on, they are giving them specialized labour rather than letting them use their trade experience, qualified as tradesmen, and the result is we are losing out in the number of qualified tradesmen and women in this province, very, very seriously.

That is going to give us a great deal of difficulty from here on out.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): I do not wish to prolong this, Mr. Speaker, but may I make it clear? I did not say I paid $170, I said I worked as a hired man on a farm, as a matter of fact in the north end of Peel County, for 12 months for $170, and my board. I saved $150 of it as a first year toward my education, and the farm boys in Ontario today are still paying higher tuition, higher fees, costing more, but they are still doing it on their own initiative. That is the point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: Well, I am very proud of the farm boys who are doing that, but I say that on the other side of the coin, no matter how much the industrial worker or the family of the industrial wage earner wanted to do that, there are not the facilities here for him to go and do the same thing regarding learning a trade in this province. No facilities.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not try it and see?

MR. FROST: Are there not trade schools.

HON. WILLIAM GREISINGER (PC Minister without Portfolio): It all depends what he means by "they have not the facilities." In the lumber business today we are taking boys out of the technical schools.

MR. MILLARD: We have no trade schools in the—

MR. GREISINGER: —to train them as cabinet makers and bench workers.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They do not know what you are talking about.

MR. MILLARD: I think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister is confusing the question of technical schools and trade schools. What I said is that the Sneeth report 38 years ago does not recommend technical schools alone, it recommends vocational schools, technical institutes, co-operative schools and trade schools. These trade schools are where they actually learn a trade, not technical education. All we have that even approaches that is the Ryerson Institute. It is really a federation of schools, and we have a small department that will train anyone particular group, any group, and they are amalgamated to come in the Institute.

That might be all right for technical training, but it does not begin to meet the situation, that is the point I want to make. It does not provide for people in Port Arthur, North Bay, Sault Ste. Marie, or anywhere else in the province. It is only scratching the surface.

MR. PORTER: We have a technical school started at the Head of the Lakes.

MR. MILLARD: That is the Technical Institute?

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: I am not talking about that. I am talking about trade schools.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): Would you explain the difference? Quite frankly, I do not understand it.

MR. MILLARD: I wish the hon. member (Mr. Thomas, Elgin) would read this report the same as I did, and he would get the difference.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): Send it over and I will.

MR. PORTER: It is probably out of print.

MR. MILLARD: It is in the library. That is where I got this one.

MR. MacLEOD: That is the reason the hon. Minister has not read it, because it is in the library.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: Some one suggests I tell the hon. Minister where the library is.

MR. PORTER: I am one of the few who uses it.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to conclude my remarks by again putting it on the record that our school teachers are very much underpaid as compared to the earnings of ordinary labour. At $1.20 per hour for 45 hours work, it totals $2,808 a year, that is for Hamilton, and you will find the school teachers are very much below that, particularly if you take in the separate school teachers with the others.

I want to conclude my remarks by giving notice of motion that there be laid before this House a return showing

the amounts of each grant paid for public school or separate school purposes in each of the years 1947 and 1948, with the date of the payment and the name of the recipient.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. McMILLAN (L Kent East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks in this, my maiden speech in this Legislature, let me take this first opportunity to congratulate you on your election to the honourable and difficult position which you hold in this chamber.

I say "difficult" because I realize now, more than ever before, just how difficult it is to maintain order at times among hon. members.

I trust I will not be subjected to interruptions as were the two financial critics of the leading opposition parties the other day when, by actual count, there were over 150 interruptions from members of the government in just the two speeches.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, I happen to be the only Liberal from west of London and on one side of me is the hon. member for Essex; on the west, the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Parry), and on the east side, is the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas); on the other side is Rondeau Bay, so you can see the position I am in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: And we are here.

MR. McMILLAN: The second week I was down here at the Legislature, I roomed with my hon. friend for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) and I thought perhaps I had better move out the second week for fear I might find there might not be any Liberal member west of London.

My riding of East Kent, as most hon. members may know, is primarily agricultural in its development and ranks among the first of our great farm counties. Our farmers concentrate on cash crops and are among the leading producers of seed corn. As a matter of fact, the first and third prizes at the International Livestock Show in Chicago were taken by seed corn from farmers in my own county, by Mr. Harry Laird and Mr. Howard Holdaway, who are neighbours of mine. Other crops of importance are beans, tobacco and onions, as well as dairy and beef cattle.

The time is approaching when the people of East Kent are anxious to take advantage of the great opportunities there are for industrial development in that area. I can think of no better beginning for such a development than that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontairo should establish one of its proposed steam generator plants in the vicinity of our great natural harbour. As some hon. members may know, this harbour site is one of the best on the Great Lakes and at the present time some 500,000 tons of coal are imported by the Lake Erie Coal Company from the United States, from Erie, Ashtabula, Conneault, Cleveland, Sandusky and Toledo. This coal is distributed through the Canadian National Railways to plants in Chatham, Leamington, Wallaceburg, London, Hamilton, etc.

A steam generating plant located at Erieau would have the great advantage of being close to the coal fields and would save a great deal of money by this fact, since coal could be shipped entirely by water at a far cheaper haulage cost than would be the case were it located further inland and require rail shipment.

Erieau is also centrally located in the western part of western Ontario, so that transmission of power to the great industrial centres of Windsor, Sarnia and London would require a minimum of line-loss in transmission.

A year ago, the executive of the Blenheim Chamber of Commerce met with hydro officials in Toronto and were promised that consideration would be given to Erieau in the plans for the establishment of steam plants. I need hardly add that an abundance of water is readily available.

We in this section of Ontario look forward to the eventual completion of

the Great St. Lawrence Waterway. We have the natural anchorage for the winter lay-up of as many as 75 freighters and would become a shipping point for European shipments from the great industrial area of Western Ontario.

I was disappointed to learn that under the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, which went through yesterday, there was not an indication of greater expansion of activities at the Western Ontario Experimental Farm at Ridgetown. We are proud of having this farm in our riding and hope that consideration will be given by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) to its further expansion and development.

I would like to remind the Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile) of the great natural summer facilities which are available along the Kent shore of Lake Erie and to suggest to him that this area be not overlooked in the department's advertising of Ontario's summer resort areas.

I want to join with other members who have spoken previously in urging that the government improve the financial situation for the superannuated school teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating our good friend, the hon. member from Durham (Mr. Foote), I see he is not in his seat at the present time, for winning the Victoria Cross and coming back here to us. I think, if there is any man in this Legislature, who should be sitting on the front benches, it is he.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. McMILLAN: I admired him for his stand the other day, but he stood alone when it came to a vote. Gentlemen, he has got what it takes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (CCF Bracondale): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel somewhat in the language of the turf, like being "left at the post" in this debate. The hon. Premier said he wished everyone in the House to have his say and say his little piece irrespective of the hour, and irrespective of the hour I am going to take a little while and say my little piece.

There is a certain amenity I wish to perform at this time, and, although Mr. Speaker is not in his Chair, I wish to congratulate him on his election to the office of Speaker. I do so with rather deep feeling because, Mr. Speaker, I have been the recipient of very kind and thoughtful action on the part of the Speaker. I have also seen in this House his ability, and I congratulate the government on their unusual judgment in appointing him to this position.

I have sat in this House with patience and forbearance, as all the hon. members have taken their turn in taking me on an imaginary Cook's tour and through journeys of fancy. They have taken me into the highways and byways of the Province of Ontario; I have been over the dams, up the rivers and lakes, into the woods. I have a suspicion that I have been taken for a few short cuts through the corn fields too. However, irrespective of that, I hope the House will be forbearing with me in my first attempt in addressing the House if I should happen to wander a little. I think consistency was one of the virtues of my paternal ancestry and I will arrive at a conclusion eventually.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WALTERS: Many of the speakers have prognosticated on different things that affect this House. I have not any particular advice as to who should be the Leader of the Tory Party. I think that is their business, I do not think it is my business.

MR. KENNEDY: That is correct.

MR. WALTER: I have a little chore to do now which I do not cherish, and that is to chastise a colleague of mine for lack of discernment or observation. The other day he made the observation that the Tory ship of state was a tramp

steamer. And, now, I think the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) was rather lax in his observation. If he had looked across the House and seen the sartorial exactitude of the hon. members over there he would have known that they could not have possibly come on a tramp steamer. It is more likely that they had come on some pleasure yatch.

I have some remarks with respect to the Budget. After all this is a Budget speech, and I suppose that should be the subject. I am no financial expert, and therefore I am not going to go on any hunt for buried treasure. All my life I have only managed to stay two jumps ahead of the bailiff. What I have to say about it is merely this. It has no meaning at all in terms of alleviation of the problems which distress the people of this province. I am very sorry to have to say that, but that is my feeling on the matter. In housing, old-age pensions, unemployed employables, the blind, and those welfare needs in which help is needed, it merely skates around them. However, in those fields where the municipalities are capable of administering themselves, it meddles. This Budget has all the implications of another political lever.

I was rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, that there were some hon. members in this House who did not even know where the Riding of Bracondale was, but it is a fact. They thought it was somewhere in the country, a rural riding. Well, for their information it is in the west end of this city. It is bounded on the south by the sky blue or yellow brown waters of Lake Ontario; on the north it is bounded by that riding which is represented by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe); on the west, the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Parks). I believe somewhere in the wilds of that riding is the lair of the beanery gang. On the east it is bounded by that riding over which the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) is the commissair of Foreign Affairs. It is a very big riding. We have every contrast, it is from rags to riches and that is a fact. In the north end of the riding you have homes which, even before inflation, I would say were valued at $50,000. Then, you will have further down a different sort of section altogether. The riding seems to be set in ghettos because you have very wealthy people, you have the bourgeoisie, and then you have the working men and down to the really poor unfortunates, who are down on their uppers. Then you have 999 Queen Street West. From there you hit a Massey-Harris plant, then the Exhibition and then Stanley Barracks. Now, Stanley Barracks is an emergency housing unit for the City of Toronto.

AN HON. MEMBER: Speak up, a little louder, please.

MR. WALTERS: On that score I think I should read into the records a few figures on housing and, I think this may interest the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). He said the other day, 31,000 homes had been built in the Province of Ontario. Now, these figures I am taking to be accurate because, as my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Millard) stated, they come from a very responsible Canadian magazine. I will give you the name of the man who wrote the article. He is the Ottawa editor for *Maclean's Magazine*; his name is Blair Fraser. I believe everyone knows him because I believe he is the Parliamentary reporter. He states, last year in the whole of Canada there was only 83,000 homes built. If 31,000 were built in Ontario, I would say we are a very lucky province for the simple reason that out of the 83,000 only 8,000 were low-rental houses, 17,000 were built under the National Housing Act and 60,000 were built on the initiative of the people who wanted homes. Now, it is a fact that back in 1939, we had a back-log of housing of over 200,000 families and that has increased in 1949 to 400,000 families. That means on the matter of housing we are not even keeping even. Here are some statistics:

110,000 couples got married;

30,000 families came in as immigrants as of 1948;

30,000 homes were broken by death or divorce.

We still have 25,000 more and there is no dent in the back-log.

Here are several short paragraphs which Blair Fraser wrote, and I think they are worthy of note. He says:

"Builders and lenders both seem to agree that government building for the low-income tenant will be necessary. Allan C. Ross, president of the Canadian Construction Association, told his annual meeting that 'low-rental housing for the low-income group is only possible with some form of government assistance.' A resolution at the same meeting called for 'adoption, as a social measure, of a modest, national, long-term, low-rental housing plan.'

"'We mean subsidized housing,' a member explained. 'We wiggle around to avoid using the word, but that's what we mean just the same.'

"Governments are much less enthusiastic about this—they know the headaches of the state landlord. Who would choose the lucky few to live in the nice new subsidized homes?

"Other obstacles face private as well as public schemes for large-scale building, and the worst of these is the shortage of serviced land.

"All the major cities of Canada except Montreal and Edmonton are solidly built up to their own municipal limits. Beyond the city limits are suburban towns with plenty of empty land, but no money to install new services—sewers, water, lighting, etc.

"There are at least two ways out of this dilemma, and probably more. One is a reform of municipal finance. Somehow, by annexation or borough system, the great metropolitan areas will have to pool their tax resources to carry their common burden. Tax-rich Toronto, would then help tax-poor North York, and so on all the way from Greater Halifax to Greater Vancouver."

Well, I am going to leave housing at that, because there is an attempt being made at the present time, in the City of Toronto, and I have attempted myself to add what little I can to break out of the dilemma they are finding themselves in; whether I have assisted or not I do not know, but at any rate they are attempting to get out of the dilemma. I think I will leave housing just at that now. I may say too much.

Among other problems facing them, they have a social problem in Bracondale because Bracondale is a melting pot. There are all kinds and sorts of people and some of them have lived there for a good many years, and there is a feeling of resentment and foreboding amongst some of them because of the trends they find in our society. In other words, they are becoming cynical towards what we call our democracy. I think we are allowing a few—and I say this advisedly—very few of our citizens who are unsocial and undemocratic to be acting in our social programmes.

We have a shortage of doctors and nurses and professional men, yet when these people of foreign extraction and other religions and other colours than ourselves, go through our educational institutions, they are free to take advantage of them, and when they leave these educational institutions they find society has already channelled their course of activities for the rest of their lives, they have been told what they can work at and in many cases it is not the profession they have studied. We lose their services. Amongst such citizens we have coloured men working as pullman porters, with B.A.'s out of our universities. We have doors slammed in the faces of some whose noses do not suit them. We have doors slammed in the faces of people because they choose to worship differently. That condition has to be broken. I am not going to suggest to the government what to do in cases like that; it would require a lot of thought, and I realize the difficulty of the problems. We know education is probably the final answer, but I think we are duty-bound to attempt something else to assist education and keep this

type of thing to a minimum in our society if we are expected to have a united society in this province and in this country. It may come about that when some of these loose strings, left to dangle, may trip us up, and it may be not too far distant. I think it behooves us to live the type of democracy we stand for.

I am a trade unionist and there are a great many trade unionists in Bracondale. I was very interested in what the hon member from Hamilton was saying in regard to power given to the hon. Minister of Labour. Somehow or other I have a feeling the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) would rather like to have this power. He would do something to solve our labour problems; I am afraid he won't get these powers and if he did get them they might prove slightly embarrassing.

Housing, which I was speaking on, has many ramifications which would lead us into other fields. It leads us into higher welfare costs, policing and fire prevention and all the rest. I have some figures here and these are from a good year. Welfare in the City of Toronto has been carried on by a great many social agencies. You have the Red Feather, covering 66 agencies, and I believe there are 30 more private agencies. In 1946 the amount spent was approximately $3,360,000 by the Red Feather Agencies in the City of Toronto. The Community Chest bore the load for 44 per cent. of this amount. The Community Chest has a paid-up payroll deduction of 52,000 workers. There is no indication from the Dominion and Provincial Governments of their stand should we be heading into a recession, then those funds are going to drop and I will be perfectly frank with you in saying the heads of the Welfare Agencies are really worried because of the fear that there will be nothing to cushion the shock when this happens. I know for one thing, last year the Community Chest had to give to the Children's Aid to the tune of $172,000.

Since I am going to speak to the bill, I will leave that. They had to cut their budget last year from $900,000 to $807,000, but the community came to their aid to the tune of $172,000. This year I know this government intends to come to their aid. But that is only one agency. What will happen to all other agencies the Red Feather is carrying on? The Red Feather pays in on payroll deduction, and in 1946, a year of high employment, they spent $3,666,000. They budgeted $4,200,000 in 1947. What the budget was in 1948, I do not know, but I know their receipts dropped $67,000 in payroll deductions. So I know if we come into a depression the demand for services will go up, and the funds from public contributions will fall. That poses a problem. What will happen? These people are definitely worried.

The hour is rather late, and I imagine the hon. members are very tired. I have told you some of these things, maybe in shorter form than I would ordinarily, but I have said pretty well what is on my mind. I have merely placed the problem of my constituency before the House. I know not what the government will do. I know what we would do on this side here. We of the CCF put people before material things. The Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) said we should make an academic approach to problems of education. I say the government should make an academic approach to the problems besetting the people of this province.

I will close with a quotation, from Henry David Thoreau:

> "I please myself with imagining a state which can afford to be just to all men."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Mr. Speaker, I took my seat in this Chamber with a feeling of reverence for the ancient traditions of this Assembly, and with a feeling of reverence for its history of struggle for social justice and freedom on behalf of the people.

However, it does seem to me that two

days ago this government was guilty of a great injustice, when they voted against the amendment recommending that this province should pay to the old-age pensioners $40 a month. I believe they committed a grave injustice.

Within 24 hours after that, the hon. members of the Cabinet saw fit to increase their salaries by $2,000 a year, which makes a total, salary and indemnity, of $13,000 for the hon. Cabinet Ministers in Ontario. $13,000 for Cabinet Ministers, and $360 a year for old-age pensioners. Mr. Speaker, I think that represents an example of shameless arrogance such as this Legislature has seldom witnessed.

During the past we have had, in this Assembly, some very great names, men who have pioneered and charted new fields, and ploughed new furrows. I am thinking at the moment of the late Sir Adam Beck, a man who had the courage and enterprise to chart a new course. He pioneered the field of electrical energy, and as a result of his efforts we have in Ontario the great Hydro-Electric enterprise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: A member of the Tory government, too.

MR. TEMPLE: In those days, I, too, was a Conservative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TEMPLE: But I am very, very sorry to say there are no Adam Becks in this government at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TEMPLE: I would like to urge the government to pioneer a new field, and to chart a new course in health.

I would like to see this government undertake a health programme for the Province of Ontario. The other day I mentioned that five provinces of Canada had undertaken the completely free hospitalization and medical care of victims of tuberculosis. I would like to place on the record the names of those five provinces, Alberta, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan. These provinces have seen fit to take care of the victims of this very serious disease. Ontario, the rich province, has not seen fit to do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the government to give serious consideration to a programme of completely free medical and hospitalization of those suffering from this terrible disease. I have lived long enough in this world to know there is nothing that is free. Some person pays for it. We do not get anything free in this world. But when I speak of "free medical services," and "health services," we do know that it is paid for by the people of this province in the form of taxes. I would urge that this method be used in order that we might supply the needs of the sufferers from this disease.

In addition, I would suggest that those who suffer from cancer should also be treated at the expense of the province—at the expense of the taxpayers—completely free from medical and hospitalization expenses. There are in the neighbourhood of 5,000 deaths annually in Ontario from cancer. The mortality rate has been increasing year after year, and I believe if this disease were treated in time, and we have a provincial scheme of hospitalization, a great many of those lives could be saved, and I would urge the government to give consideration to this fact.

In addition, too, I would like to suggest that venereal diseases, and those suffering from mental illnesses should also be treated completely free and the responsibility for their care should be assumed by this province.

The diagnoses and treatment of tuberculosis, cancer, venereal diseases and mental illnesses are so expensive that for a large proportion of our population they amount to an almost unbelievable burden.

In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the case of these diseases has been made the responsibility on a provincial level, whereas in Ontario, in spite of our vast

resources, provincial aid for sufferers from these conditions is niggardly in comparison. Surely the restoration of even a few of the victims of these conditions, should repay many times in any extra expenditure which might be involved.

Speaking in a debate on the Speech from the Throne, the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) made a statement as follows, when dealing with health and hospital grants:

> "Our system of capital grants introduced in 1946 for the first time in the history of our province has benefited 31 hospitals, by an amount of $1,602,000. Many other building projects have been developed to the point of approval, and building operations have commenced. It is expected that 7,700 new beds will be available as a result of this further evidence of governmental interest in the well-being of the people."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TEMPLE: That appears at page 75 of *Hansard,* of February 15th. That was a statement made by the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy).

I would like to state, however, that the returns in the House of Commons show that not 7,700 beds are being provided for the people of Ontario, but subsidies have been granted for only 899 beds.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is quite obvious and apparent. In Ontario our grant system is ahead of the Dominion system. Our system was introduced at least a year and a half before the Dominion entered the field. The fact of the matter is, that our approval of beds was far ahead of the Dominion's approval. I could give you right now an example of several hospitals where we have provided the grants, but the Dominion people have not approved of them as yet. No doubt they will. It all takes time. I am not criticizing the Dominion people for that, but they will have a lot to approve in the next month or two.

My hon. friend (Mr. Temple) must also remember that the approval of these beds does not depend on the Provincial Government. The approval is made on the application of the hospital itself. I will give you an example. Some time ago we approved of something in the neighbourhood of 600 beds for the Hospital for Sick Children. I know the Dominion's approval has not been given on that as yet, because they have to comply with the governmental regulations. That is the reason for the difference in those figures.

MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Speaker, I have information—in fact, I understand—an application is being made for additional hospital beds totalling 2,400, and even that is a long way below the hon. Premier's (Mr. Kennedy) statement that they have 7,700 beds in process at the present time.

Even 7,700 is far below the needs of the province at the present moment.

When the CCF in Saskatchewan were elected to office, the number of hospital beds per capita totalled three per thousand of population. Because of the government's scheme of hospitalization, whereby the people of the province are asked to pay $5 a year originally—it is now increased this year to $10 per year, but with a maximum of $30 per family —the province has been able to increase the number of beds to 7.6 per thousand people in the province. That, Mr. Speaker, is the highest of any province in Canada.

This province is badly in need of more hospitals. Everywhere we go we find the hospitals are so crowded that even emergency cases are unable to get into the hospitals, because of the conditions existing. It does seem to me this is an opportune time to undertake a scheme of hospitalization. As I said before, I have lived long enough to know there is nothing free in this world. It is all paid for. But I submit the efficient, the economical and the best way of handling the problem is to have the government tax the people—call it "insurance" if

you will; it is still the same—and as a result of the money they receive to construct the necessary hospitals throughout the province.

I was in the area of Parry Sound during the by-election. I did not even get—

AN HON. MEMBER: It was time wasted.

MR. TEMPLE: I do not think it was altogether wasted. I think it will bear fruit in the future, as it has in other areas, in the past. I was very very disturbed to find in some of the rural areas that the nearest hospital was 50 miles away, towns which were fairly substantial in size, with two or three hundred people, and yet they had to travel a distance of 50 miles to find a hospital, and then the hospital was usually overcrowded, and they could not get in the place.

I suggest that under a planned system of hospitalization, we could place these health centres in the areas in which they would best serve the people of the province, and the people would be much better off. They would have much better facilities, and they would be a happier and a better people.

I now want to quote a quotation from Disraeli, who once said:

> "The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and the powers of the State depends. The conservation of the public health is the first duty of a statesman."

I would recommend that to the hon. Conservative members of the government at the present time.

I believe the people of the province are crying for adequate health services, and they are not getting them. They could get them very easily.

I would like to spend a few minutes—and I am nearly finished—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TEMPLE: Thank you—to deal with another aspect, and that is some of the voluntary health schemes which are prevalent in the province, and also some of the commercial health schemes which we hear about on the radio.

Although I believe very strongly that the province should be responsible for the organization of the general system of health services, and shall continue to advocate this, I realize that there is little likelihood of the present government taking any effective steps in this direction. The people of the province will, therefore, be forced to depend on individual or group insurance schemes to provide for the cost of illness.

There are two general classes of such insurance. First, the non-profit organizations, which are run by various groups, and whose plans include a large proportion of the population. These organizations are undoubtedly run by people who are well-intentioned, and who are not looking for any financial gain. But those who patronize them, have no means of knowing how efficiently they are being run, or what justification there is for their charges. No adequate financial statements are sent by these organizations to their clients. Surely it is not unreasonable to demand that regular and complete financial statements should be issued to subscribers, so that they could have a more adequate basis for determining the value they are receiving for their money. I know, for example, that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) has a full 1947 financial statement from the Blue Cross. He will probably get another one in 1948, but I question whether he had the Blue Cross 1948 financial statement in January of this year, when I understood he gave approval to substantially increasing the amounts by over 100 per cent. in one year, to the Blue Cross subscribers. Since the hon. Minister (Mr. Kelley) has authorized the increase already, I suggest he table in this House right now, if possible — although he is not here tonight—the financial statement of that organization, in order that the public may have the facts.

Now, the other group, is that of

commercial insurance. These organizations are run for profit, and some of their practises leave very much to be desired. It is advertised freely and would imply that their policies cover all the contingencies and circumstances, but in nearly all instances, buried in small print at the bottom of the contract or policy, one usually finds a small clause or clauses, which exclude many of the conditions which the individual thinks he is insuring against.

We urge most strongly that this type of misrepresentation by implication be prohibited, and that regulations be passed that would make it obligatory for these companies to place in some conspicuous position in their policies and advertising the exceptions and restrictions which appertain to their policies.

MR. FROST: I may say to the hon. member (Mr. Temple) that the Department of Insurance is presently looking over that situation. We are quite conscious of the fact that some of these companies which are advertising are doing it in a way which is misleading. I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Temple) that we are anxious to take care of that situation, in no uncertain way.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is quite a problem.

MR. FROST: Indeed it is, a great problem. I would like to tell the hon. member (Mr. Temple) as regards the matter of hospital services and hospitalization generally, that the danger to people who have been availing themselves of various plans, like the plans provided by the Medical Association and the Blue Cross and others is that it is creating a very considerable hospital problem in this province. You can see the reason. We have not the hospital beds. That is one of the reasons why, in connection with the Dominion proposals for 1945, the matter was looked into by the provinces, and it was felt we were not ready to go into a scheme of general hospitalization, for the reason that in taxing our people and getting money from them, when they became ill and required to go to hospital, there were not hospital beds available. That is why the government declined it, the way they did.

We were the first province to introduce the hospital grants, and were followed by the Dominion, and we have done something none of the other provinces has done, and that is, we are giving a maintenance grant for every public-ward bed, which runs from $2.35 per bed per day—

MR. JOLLIFFE: So did the Dominion.

MR. FROST: No, the Dominion gave no maintenance grant.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They are giving building grants.

MR. FROST: Yes, they have followed our plan for building grants, but they have not followed our maintenance grants, which we think is an essential part of the agreement. No doubt that will carry the hospitalization problem a little farther ahead.

MR. TEMPLE: I would like to point out to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that the Province of Saskatchewan had exactly the same problem and they tackled it and solved it, and now they have hospital accommodations to serve the needs of the people who are sick.

MR. FROST: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Park) is confusing beds which have been approved with beds which are available.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh no.

MR. FROST: The people of Saskatchewan are presently running into the same difficulty we anticipated here. They are accepting money from their people for hospital purposes, and they have not the accommodations to give them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But they still have many more beds than you have.

MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Speaker, earlier in my remarks I made the statement

that in 1944 when the CCF Government was elected, there were 3.1 beds per thousand of population in the Province of Saskatchewan, and because of the government's undertaking this service, it has now risen to 7.6 beds per thousand of population, the highest of any province in the Dominion. They have tackled the problem, and they have solved it, and the people who are ill are able to get the care they require, and I want to say that I think the entire people of the province, Liberals, Conservatives, or CCF-ers, are solidly behind the hospital programme of the government.

MR. FROST: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I noted that in the address of the hon. Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan (Mr. Fine) that the population of Saskatchewan, since 1940, has increased by 8,000. Our population has increased by about 650,000 — a big difference.

MR. MILLARD: I thought they had all come down here from Saskatchewan.

MR. FROST: They have. They have come down here in droves.

MR. TEMPLE: The population has been increased at a very rapid rate, but the government has not done one single thing about providing increased hospital accommodation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

MR. FROST: You are quite wrong.

MR. TEMPLE: They have, however, been encouraging the construction of cocktail bars and breweries throughout the province, but they do not seem to be able to devote any of their energies to building hospitals, in order to serve the needs of the people throughout the province.

MR. FROST: I wonder if you have not been looking around. Down University Avenue here, on one side of the street is a great hospital, with 600 beds, and right across the road is another new hospital, the Mount Sinai Hospital. That is happening all over the province.

MR. JOLLIFFE: After 20 years of talking.

MR. SALSBERG: That was all done by private subscriptions; very little of it was done by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Speaker, I am going to close—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TEMPLE: Thank you. However, I will not go on any further. I will urge the government to give consideration to a health programme and a hospitalization scheme if they want to be elected at the next election, because I am quite sure that unless something is in force by then, they will be turned out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HARRY A. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Leader of the House (Mr. Frost) if he will accept adjournment at this point?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. NIXON: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I know something about it, but would the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) indicate the programme tomorrow, and remind the House that we meet at 1.30?

MR. FROST: First of all, I will remind the House that we meet at 1.30, and the programme is bills tomorrow, and bills on Monday, and perhaps some estimates.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dover-

court): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) if we will have an opportunity to take up some of the bills moved by the private members of this House?

MR. FROST: The government programme is so extensive and so important, that it is engaging all the time of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.58 o'clock p.m.

Vol. III, No. 22

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Friday, March 11, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 11, 1949

Women's Wage Rates, bill to amend, **Mr. Park,** first reading..... 785

The Companies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading..... 785

The Marriage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading..... 785

The Telephone Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading..... 786

Legal Status and Boundaries of Municipalities, bill to determine, introduced by Mr. Dunbar, first reading..... 786

Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading..... 787

Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading..... 787

Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading... 787

Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway, bill respecting, Mr. Griesinger, second reading..... 788

Athletics Control Act, bill to amend, **Mr. Frost,** second reading..... 788

Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, second reading..... 793

Income Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, second reading..... 793

Provincial Loans Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, second reading..... 794

Succession Duty Act, 1939, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, second reading 795

Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Kennedy, agreed to 795

Niagara Parks Act, 1949, introduced by Mr. Daley, bill reported 797

The Federation for Community Service of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, bill reported 807

The Mount McKay and Kakabeka Falls Railway Company, bill respecting, Mr. Cox, bill reported 807

The Incorporated Synod of The Diocese of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, bill reported 808

An Act Respecting The Township of Scarborough, bill respecting, Miss MacPhail, bill reported 808

An Act Respecting Wycliffe College, introduced by, Mr. Rea, bill reported 808

Incorporated Synod of The Diocese of Ontario, bill respecting, Mr. Stewart, bill reported 808

An Act to Establish The Frontenac High School District, introduced by, Mr. Pringle, bill reported 808

L'Institut Jeanne D'Arc, bill respecting, Mr. Nault, bill reported 808

City of Chatham, bill respecting, Mr. Parry, bill reported 809

Hospital For Sick Children, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, bill reported 809

City of Belleville, bill respecting, Mr. Sandercock, bill reported 809

McMaster University, bill respecting, Mr. Hamilton, bill reported 809

Ontario Co-operative Credit Society, bill to incorporate, Mr. Cathcart, bill reported 809

Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Kennedy, agreed to 810

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1949.

1.30 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 1.30 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

WOMEN'S WAGE RATES

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Miss MacPhail, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting Women's Wage Rates" and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE COMPANIES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I, move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Companies Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) be good enough to explain the nature of his bill?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this bill is a revision of Part XII of The Companies Act, which deals with the Corporation of Co-operatives. It is a complete revision of that part of the Act. The terms of the revision have been worked out over a period of negotiations with the Union of Co-operatives, and is in accordance with their wishes and with the practice that has grown up in connection with co-operatives.

I do not know whether I should go into any great detail at the present time. It will come out on second reading.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Marriage Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): Margarine?

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) mind explaining the bill?

MR. DUNBAR: When The Vital Statistics Act was introduced last year, the fact had been overlooked there was a form to be filled in by the person solemnizing the marriage. That was also on the marriage certificate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unnecessary.

MR. DUNBAR: Everything that is on there is quite necessary. There are two numbers less than in the Province of Saskatchewan. They have got them

all. There are no more questions to answer than are necessary.

However, the clergyman, or the person solemnizing the marriage, had to fill in the form on the marriage certificate. We are now requesting the parties engaging in the marriage to fill in the form, and the clergyman will simply send it on to the department.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): We were going to suggest that, too.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE TELEPHONE ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Telephone Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) explain?

MR. DUNBAR: In The Telephone Act, for municipal telephones, there never was anything giving the municipality permission to close off the company, or as you may say, the municipal telephone system. Therefore, if they found themselves in difficulty and were selling out the whole company or a portion of it to any other company, there was no legal way of doing so. We want the Act to enable them to apply to the Municipal Board, and if a portion of the telephone system is sold, all liabilities outstanding be first paid and the balance of the money placed in the hands of the municipality. If the total amount of the telephone system is sold out however, all these debts—the liabilities and debentures outstanding—might be cleaned off, then the Municipal Board will call all the subscribers they can find. No doubt the hon. member (Mr. McEwing), who asked the question, understands that some of these companies running over a period of years have farmer subscribers who may have sold their farm and the privilege of having the telephone went with the farm.

Perhaps the man who had taken over the farm did not require the telephone, or did not have it anyway, so it is very difficult for the Municipal Board to determine exactly who is entitled to it. However, they do endeavour to find out and distribute the money equally amongst the remaining subscribers whom they can find.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LEGAL STATUS AND BOUNDARIES OF MUNICIPALITIES

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act for Quieting Doubts Affecting the Legal Status and Boundaries of Municipalities," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L GREY South): The wrong man, George.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would give us an explanation.

MR. DUNBAR: There are a number of municipalities in the Province of Ontario which really do not know where their boundaries begin or where they end. There is a dispute between several of the townships or counties, so we think it would be wise, in order to save a lot of litigation between municipalities, to have them appeal to the Municipal Board, which will bring in a surveyor and have the township or county, as the case may be, re-surveyed. The results of the survey will go on record as determining the boundary line.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Nothing to do with Nepean Township, has it?

MR. DUNBAR: No, nothing to do with Nepean.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

VITAL STATISTICS ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1948," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, may we have an explanation?

MR. DUNBAR: This has reference to two instances in our Act which was introduced last year and which came into effect the first of July. One was regarding a person who had passed away, in which case, it was stated in The Vital Statistics Act, the remains had to be viewed by the attending physician, and the papers made out and so on. We find that is not workable. Even here in the City of Toronto, a physician might be attending a man in Western Hospital and might then be 10 miles away, but still in the city, and if the man passed away at 2 o'clock in the morning it is unreasonable to expect one should call that doctor, who had left him perhaps at 12 o'clock, knowing he was on the way out, to come and simply say he had viewed the remains.

In the country, especially the north country, it was impossible. It could not be worked out, therefore, we have some responsible person, the nurse in charge and so on, persons of that nature, view the remains and certify the person is dead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER: And bury him anyway.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): To remove any doubts, you mean?

MR. DUNBAR: We do not want any doubts.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps it should be a "Quieting Doubts Bill."

MR. DUNBAR: The other was just changing over. They go together, these two, with The Marriage Act, the other part of it.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, may we have something on that?

MR. DUNBAR: This is a bill I would like in second reading to go before the committee, so the committee members of the House will have an opportunity of seeing exactly how it fits in and what it means. We want it to go with the other Municipal Acts, and The Public Utilities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

I would ask permission also for that to go before the committee.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): 64th Order.

SANDWICH, WINDSOR AND AMHERSTBURG RAILWAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 64; second reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting the Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway," Mr. Griesinger.

HON. WILLIAM GRIESINGER (PC Minister without portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting the Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. KENNEDY: 63rd Order.

ATHLETICS CONTROL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 63rd Order; second reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to amend The Athletics Control Act, 1947," Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to amend The Athletics Control Act, 1947."

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister (Mr. Frost) elaborate somewhat on this bill?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this Act for a number of years, was administered by the Minister of Health. Subsequently its administration, by means of an amendment, which I think was passed a year or two ago, was placed with the Provincial Treasurer. The intention now is to place administration of this Act with the Minister of Education who has the administration of the community programmes and physical fitness departments, and legislation.

I think the reason for this is quite evident. The origin of this Act was that it would be of assistance in the matter of athletics and things of that sort. During the course of the years, the purpose has been enlarged so that the Department of Education has come into this picture, and, as you will notice, there are large appropriations in connection with it.

You will notice, I believe it is Section 1, subsection 2, provides "that 'the Minister' shall mean any Minister as may from time to time be designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in council." It is the intention to transfer that over to the Minister of Education. At the present time there are no commissioners. Mr. Apps resigned some time ago, and the commission has been operated by the secretary, Mr. Steele. Mr. Steele and all his works and undertakings are being transferred over to the Minister of Education.

MR. OLIVER: You are in effect "washing out" the Athletics Commission?

MR. FROST: Oh, no, we will still keep the Athletics Commission, but we will have it as part of the Physical Fitness Department of the Department of Education. I think hon. members will see the reason for that. It is now very, very difficult indeed, if not impossible, to determine what is professional sport and what is not professional sport.

I see my hon. friend for Kitchener-Waterloo (Mr. Brown) here today, and I might say he had some difficulties in determining what was professional and what was not professional. The old line of demarkation is gone. It is now possible for players in certain formerly amateur connections to go and play two or three professional games and then go back and play amateur again.

What is the division? I must admit it is beyond my capabilities to determine. I think it might properly be left with the hon. Minister of Education, who seems to have a lot of ability in administering things of that sort, and no doubt the rarefied atmosphere of the Department of Education might be good for this particular branch of sport.

That brings up the matter of the taxes involved. Years ago a tax running from, I think, 2 per cent. to 5 per cent. was permitted, and that amount was placed in a special fund. It was used to purchase lacrosse sticks and hockey

sticks for little communities throughout the country. The result was, it was quite satisfactory in its early stages, but as time went on it meant an uneven distribution. Then the Department of Education came along with a physical fitness scheme, and the purpose of those little grants has disappeared and they are becoming absorbed in the programmes of the Department of Education, with the result the fund which had been collected was somewhat "up in the air."

At the present time, speaking just from memory, I think there is about $80,000 in the fund. Perhaps in the last amendment, the amendment of some two years ago, that was transferred over to The Consolidated Revenue Fund; if not, it is by the present Act. The intention is it should be transferred to The Consolidated Revenue Fund, and we would rub out that fund.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in connection with this, it was my intention to recommend to the House that the 2 per cent. tax should be abolished. I think the reasons for that are plain also. In the meantime, with the consent of this House, we passed an Act a year ago imposing a 20 per cent. amusement or hospital tax and the result is, that in some cases it imposed a 22 per cent. tax. That is the effect of it. It is actually a 22 per cent. tax.

As I say, it would try the wisdom of Solomon to try to determine what is professional and what is not professional these days. The result is in some cases we are collecting the 2 per cent. tax and in other cases we are not collecting it.

It seemed desirable to abolish the tax entirely. I know some of the hon. members will wonder why the tax is still being retained, as far as boxing and wrestling is concerned. I think it is referred to in section 2 (a). We retained it for this purpose; these are very wild and woolly types of professional sport, which are purely professional, and which require some discipline, and if we took away the tax, it may take away from the Commissioner certain controls he has at the present time. I admit it may not be a desirable control, but it does provide a method of licensing and control by the Board, which to some extent—I do not think I would go beyond what is proper in saying—is somewhat of a "racket." We all admit, in connection with the wrestling, certain practises have grown up which have been very widely commented upon. This is to give Mr. Steele some measure of control over that situation.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) surely is not saying that boxing is a "racket."

MR. FROST: No. But I would say to the hon. member (Mr. Houck) that at the present time we are receiving a very large number of, not only complaints, but suggestions from amateur circles in connection with boxing. I am not referring to purely amateur type of sport. I am referring to the professional type, and my hon. friend (Mr. Houck) knows this—

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Like "Gorgeous George."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Yes, or the Masked Marvel, and some others.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): To whom are you referring?

MR. J. L. DOWLING (CCF Hamilton East): To George Drew, not George Dunbar.

MR. FROST: We want to keep some control over this. It was my intention to recommend we repeal the tax entirely, but in reviewing it, it appeared that, until we could do something to regularize things, we should retain the tax, for the purpose of regulation and control.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I did not intend to speak on this bill, Mr. Speaker, but the point the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has just made interests me very much. I am wondering if it is a sound principle of taxation to vest

in the hon. Minister, or his Deputy, or a Commissioner, a discretion as to the imposition of a tax for disciplinary purposes. I may have misunderstood the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). As I understand it, that is the reason for not discarding the tax altogether.

MR. FROST: No, not for the purpose of discipline, Mr. Speaker, but for the purpose of control, because licences are required.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That seems to me to be a distinction without a difference. If it is for the purpose of licensing, it is the same thing. You want to have the power to discipline a business which you may think may be conducted along undesirable lines. If there is the danger of the business being conducted along undesirable lines, it would seem there should be some power vested in the Commissioner, or somebody, to discipline and regulate the business, because as I understand it, the sport to which the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) referred is a business.

What I am questioning is the use of the taxing power in a discretionary way in order to regulate and discipline a business. That seems to me a new departure, and a rather questionable departure. I cannot think of any analogy in the statutes authorizing taxation, and the use of the tax in that way, even though it may be associated with the licensing power, to me seems questionable. The hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) may be right. This is new to me, but it seems to be rather questionable.

MR. FROST: I will say to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) the statute gives the right to levy a tax from 1 per cent. to 5 per cent. The real point involved is that they give the officials of the commission, the Treasurer, or the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) the right to go in and ascertain if a sport is professional or not. In connection with boxing and wrestling, that is an issue, and I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) when we get complaints and suggestions from a great host of organizations which are strictly amateur, they want an investigation, and want to find out where they stand. I think my hon. friend from Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) will agree with me on this, that all is not healthy in that branch of sport.

It was my intention to recommend to the House the repeal of that Act. I would strongly recommend that it be left there for another year, and let the commission become organized in its new home in the Department of Education, where we have the physical fitness organization covering all branches of sport, both amateur and professional and we probably will be able to get some order out of this.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) a question? You say you are not going to abolish the Athletic Commission?

MR. FROST: No.

MR. HOUCK: Will the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) be in charge of that, or will there be another appointment?

MR. FROST: There will be another appointment. Mr. Steele has been in charge of the commission, and has been doing a very good job.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (L. Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two in a general sort of way. By this Act we are putting the Athletic Commission under the Department of Education. We are transferring its financial assets to the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the province. I do not know that I have any particular objection to that procedure, except this, Mr. Speaker, that it would seem to me that putting this commission under the Department of Education, would create a tendency to give particular stress to the working of this commission, and its duties, through the school systems of the province. And it would seem to me, further, very logical that this would work to the detriment of the amateur sports associations throughout the length and breadth of Ontario. It would seem to me that the main stress would be through the schools, and you would

be hurting, to a degree at least, these amateur associations.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has said the line of demarcation between what is professional and amateur sports is very hard to define in these days. I think perhaps I could go along with him in that, to an extent. But I say it is in the interests of amateur sport to make that line of demarcation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: We have to find out where that line is, and we have to help these associations more than we have been during these last few years. They stand for the upbuilding of amateur sport in the Province of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Amateur sport, these last few years, has not been receiving grants to any extent from the Athletic Commission, and they are protesting. The hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) knows that the amateur sports associations have been in touch with him, and have been protesting that they have not been receiving grants under the Athletic Commission Act. I want to impress upon the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) that in my judgment there is very little we can do in this House which would have greater value than to have a real clarification of amateur sport in the Province of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: And the building up of a desire in the hearts of our young men and women to partake of and participate in good, clean amateur sport.

I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) feels the same way I do, and thinks along the same lines, but I want to be assured that this House is in the confidence of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to the extent that we in this province are going to give full attention to the clarification and improvement and advancing of what is, after all, amateur sport.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): What do you mean "partake of"?

MR. OLIVER: I do not know in what connection I used the words.

MR. BLACKWELL: Do you mean to partake of the gate receipts?

MR. OLIVER: I am still in the dark.

MR. BLACKWELL: I thought you were.

MR. OLIVER: If you will get up on your feet and tell me what you mean, I will answer you.

MR. FROST: There is no great division in what he is endeavouring to accomplish. I think my hon friend (Mr. Oliver) will agree that it is impossible at the present time to define the line between amateur sports and professionalism. Let us be frank. That is the situation. I well remember in my younger days I had an uncle who was a professional lacrosse player, and it was a first-class family disgrace. It was only mentioned when the immediate family was present. But times have changed, and now if a person can get a place on the Maple Leaf hockey team, that is something; he stands high in the community. We have an entirely different point of view in connection with these matters than we formerly had.

The difficulty with which I have been faced in the last couple of years—and I think the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) at one time was also faced with it—was that we had the administration of one particular branch of sport, yet we had growing up some place else in the Department of Education something which helped amateur sport, adult activity, and community progress. The difficulty was there was always a place where there was never anything done. Somebody always said, "We do not know anything about that; we had better leave it to the other people," and the other people would say, "We do not know anything about it; we had better leave it to the Athletic Commission,"

and so on. The result was that nothing was done.

We thought, to get around the difficulty, we would put it all under one control, and keep and maintain a commission there and we feel they will become immensely more useful than they were in the past, because they will be in a position to see the whole picture, and, in some ways, have complete control of the whole thing.

I can assure my friend (Mr. Oliver) that we intend to do everything possible. For instance, in connection with the community skating rinks, and athletic fields, and community programmes in general; this has gone far beyond just being a matter of the education of school children. These are related to adult activities. We have thought it would be a lot better if we keep it under one head and proceed with it in a practical way, with an administrative set-up which will really work.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, there seems to me to be another phase regarding the principle of this bill, about which I would like to enquire. It does not state in the bill, as I see it, that it is to be the Ministry of Education; it is left open; it is at the discretion of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I have no particular quarrel with the suggestion made that it be turned over to the Ministry of Education. But I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Ministry of Education is not now already overburdened. Here we have a Department of Government which is already responsible for a very important segment of our society, for about 25 per cent. of our entire budget, and this is under a part-time Minister at the present time, and has been for some considerable time.

MR. FROST: No, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is a full-time Minister of Education, and part-time with regard to the Provincial Secretary's office only.

MR. MILLARD: It seems to me this is important enough to require a full-time Minister. I think it is more than one man can do properly. One of the difficulties in the past in dealing with educational organizations, such as the Teachers' Federation, is they have been greatly retarded and hampered by the fact that the previous hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Drew) was also the Premier, and could not be contacted for interviews regarding educational matters. It seems to me—and again I say I have no quarrel with the suggestion of the principle that this be transferred to the Department of Education—but certainly I think it is overburdening a Ministry which is not full-time at this particular work. I strongly urge the government, if we are going to continue to load the Ministry of Education with greater and greater responsibility, they make sure it is a full-time portfolio.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks just made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard). It seems to me it is about time the present government did something toward implementing a commitment made, I believe, in 1945, by the former Premier of this province (Mr. Drew) to the effect that you were going to set up a Ministry of Youth and Recreation. I do not have the clipping before me at the moment, but if you doubt that pledge or promise, I will be glad to table on Monday the newspaper report of the announcement by Mr. Drew.

I think the government has within its ranks now people who could do an excellent job as Minister of Youth and Recreation. If you want me to make a recommendation, I would recommend the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote) for that post.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: He is one of your youngest men and a great national hero of this country. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the point made by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) is very sound. We have been shifting this thing around from pillar to post so that the rôle that this commission

ought to play in the life of this province is completely lost. I do not think the present hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is capable of wrestling with these wrestlers, about whom you are so much worried. He is a very overburdened man; he is taking over a new department, and I do not think he will be able to do justice to it, and I feel you should tackle it in another way.

One other point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, and it is this; I am very sorry, as I am sure all the hon. members are, that this government allowed Mr. Syl Apps to slip out from the position of chairman of the Athletic Commission. It seems to me he was an admirable man for that post, and I only hope that he was not permitted to go because the government was not prepared to pay him an adequate salary. I think the salary now paid is $5,000, if I am not mistaken, and it would be too bad if Mr. Apps took a job in the business world because he needed a little extra money, which this government is certainly in a position to pay him. I think the government should explore the possibilities of finding a man of Mr. Apps' stature to head up this work, until such time as you get around to establishing a full-fledged Ministry of Youth and Recreation in the Province of Ontario.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to learn that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) proposes to leave this tax on wrestling and boxing matches on for another year. It does seem to me that this tax is discriminating against a very good, clean sport. I do not know why he should pick on boxing and wrestling for a special form of taxation. He did not touch baseball, nor rugby games, nor football, nor other professional contests, but we are picking, in this particular bill, on particular type of sport. Boxing and wrestling are good, clean, wholesome sports, which we should encourage if possible.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) has suggested that it was perhaps a sort of a "racket."

MR. FROST: In part.

MR. TEMPLE: I would suggest he step into the ring, just to try it out.

MR. FROST: I might get in with the Masked Marvel.

MR. TEMPLE: I would suggest you try the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter). The Maple Leaf Gardens is in his constituency, and he would not have far to go. Or you might consider the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). He might be interested.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TEMPLE: He would have the weight advantage in any event.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): You are too keen.

MR. TEMPLE: I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) to reconsider his decision. It is true there is an element of entertainment in wrestling matches, but, nevertheless, 20 per cent. is quite a stiff tax, without adding anything additional. I am sure it is discriminating, and I hope you will reconsider the bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. KENNEDY: 62nd Order.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT, 1939

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 62nd Order; second reading of Bill No. 115, "An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act, 1939," Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 115, "An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act, 1939."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. KENNEDY: 61st Order.

INCOME TAX ACT (ONTARIO)

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 61st Order; second reading of Bill No. 114,

"An Act to suspend The Income Tax Act (Ontario)," Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 114, "An Act to suspend The Income Tax Act (Ontario)."

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): I am just a bit interested, Mr. Speaker, in seeing this Act should come before the House after the remarks I made to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) the other day.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. KENNEDY: 60th Order.

PROVINCIAL LOANS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 60th Order; second reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend The Provincial Loans Act," Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend The Provincial Loans Act."

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): I think we should have the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) give an explanation. The reason I am suggesting that he explain this Act, is that in the Budget address a week ago, he touched on this lightly and one of the things I thought I heard him say I am not quite agreeable to. I wish he would say them again.

MR. FROST: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I have never yet found an occasion when the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) was in agreement with me. I think he is always against anything I say. I would refer him to page 562 of *Hansard*. The purpose of this bill is to permit of better management from the public's standpoint of the public debt, and to permit registration of bonds and their conversion into larger denominations than we have at the present time. As I said, as reported on page 562 of *Hansard*, a statement is given in relation to that, and I think this is one occasion when my hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) could agree with me. You see, here we are with the Power Commission and we have to bring the Power Commission into this scheme, with the Power Commission and ourselves raising large sums of money for development purposes, it is desirable to have it so that these bonds can be registered both as to principal and interest. That is an innovation as far as we are concerned. We think it is something which will add greatly to the salability of our securities and secure us lower rates of interest.

MR. WISMER: I agreed in general. I presume what you are going to do is make it possible for $1,000 denominations of bond to be brought to some registrar and be changed for $100,000.

MR. FROST: Not necessarily, you may bring in $100 and get one for $100,000. Oh, yes.

MR. WISMER: That is what I mean and by the same token bring in a $100,000 certificate and have it broken up into $1,000.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. WISMER: That was not clear the other day.

MR. FROST: It is clearly a case of salability and protection.

MR. WISMER: And you are going to make provision for the first time for registration of securities?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. WISMER: Will there be any charges in connection with this?

MR. FROST: No, I do not think so.

MR. WISMER: The Dominion usually charges, or used to charge.

MR. FROST: I will certainly look into it if they do.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. KENNEDY: 59th Order.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT, 1939

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 59th Order, second reading of Bill No. 112, "An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act, 1939," Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act, 1939."

MR. C. C. CALDER (L London): Mr. Speaker, there is a matter of principle involved which I wish the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would explain. On the 25th of May, last year, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) made a speech in which he said this change was to be made. I am given to understand that on the 26th of May, a departmental directive was sent out saying, effective immediately exemption should be made as if this change had been made.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. CALDER: That explanation suits me.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much money the Treasury will lose by "upping" the exemption to $50,000?

MR. FROST: We estimate about $600,000 a year. Of course, that depends upon the number of estates and what not, but it would appear to be in that neighbourhood.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

MR. KENNEDY: I beg to inform the House, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter, recommends the consideration of the House to the following resolutions:

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 14, Mr. Blackwell.

"Resolved, That subsidies may be paid to municipalities to assist in the organization and operation of municipal fire departments under the provisions of Bill No. 107, The Fire Departments Act, 1949."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 15, Mr. Blackwell.

"Resolved, That subsidies may be paid to municipalities to assist in the operation of municipal police departments under the provisions of Bill No. 108, The Police Act, 1949."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 16, Mr. Doucett.

"Resolved, That subsidies may be paid to municipalities in respect to expenditures made for the improvement of roads under the provisions of Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 17, Mr. Goodfellow.

"Resolved, That subsidies may be paid to assist in establishing, erecting and maintaining homes for the aged under Bill No. 110, The Homes for the Aged Act, 1949."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 18, Mr. Goodfellow.

"Resolved, That subsidies may be paid to municipalities in respect of expenditures made for the maintenance of children committed to the custody of a children's aid society, and that grants may be made to children's aid societies under the provisions of Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Children's Protection Act."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 19, Mr. Frost.

"Resolved, That (a) certain religious organizations shall be exempt from succession duty; and

(b) preferred beneficiaries shall be exempt from succession duty where the aggregate value of the estate does not exceed $50,000; and

(c) the payment of succession duty by any person who benefits under an annuity, term of years, life estate or income created by will may be paid in certain equal annual instalments, as provided by Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act, 1939."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 20, Mr. Frost.

"Resolved, That the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Conucil may raise money by the issue and sale of debentures, and that the principal of such debentures and the interest thereon may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund as provided by Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Provincial Loans Act."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 21, Mr. Frost.

"Resolved, That notwithstanding any of the provisions of The Income Tax Act (Ontario) and amendments, no tax shall be levied under the said Act on income of the calendar year nineteen hundred and forty-nine as provided by Bill No. 114, An Act to suspend The Income Tax Act (Ontario)."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 22, Mr. Frost.

"Resolved, That,

(a) a deduction may be allowed to all newly incorporated companies that establish head offices in Ontario, equal to the amount of any loss which they sustain from the date of incorporation to the commencement of the fiscal year during which they first earn a profit; and

(b) all investment companies exempt from tax on income under The Income Tax Act (Canada) shall be exempt from tax on income under The Corporations Tax Act; and

(c) certain deductions now allowed for development expenses incurred by mining companies may be broadened, as provided by Bill No. 115, An Act to amend The Corporation Tax Act, 1939."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 23, Mr. Frost.

"Resolved, That every person conducting a professional boxing or wrestling contest or exhibition shall pay to the Minister an amount not less than one per centum and not exceeding five per centum of the gross receipts in respect of such contest or exhibition as shall be determined by the Minister with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and that except as aforesaid the tax payable under The Athletics Control Act, 1947, by persons conducting professional contests or exhibitions be abolished as provided by Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Athletics Control Act, 1947."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 24, Mr. Griesinger.

"Resolved, That

(a) The outstanding capital debt, matured and unmatured, of and owing with respect to the railway, howsoever incurred and by and to whomsoever the same is owing, shall be for all purposes and as to all persons, natural and corporate, fixed and established as of the 30th day of June, 1948; and

(b) The capital debt so fixed and established shall be assumed, borne, paid and discharged; and

(c) part of the capital debt which is made the obligation of Ontario shall be borne and paid by Ontario under the guarantee of payment thereof; and

(d) the bonds and debentures of the railway company and Windsor, respectively, when issued shall be delivered to the Treasurer of Ontario as the absolute property of Ontario or of its assigns in the case of sale thereof or of any portion thereof by Ontario; and

(e) the railway company shall have power to establish a sinking fund with the Treasurer of Ontario and pay to the Treasurer certain sums of money and the sums so paid may be accepted by the Treasurer who may establish a special account and credit interest on the sum and on the 1st day of April, 1980, the Treasurer may pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the amount at the credit of such special account to the holder of such sinking fund bonds; and

(f) the railway company shall deposit with the Treasurer of Ontario the aggregate amount of interest falling due on the outstanding, unmatured, guaranteed bonds and the Treasurer shall pay such interest to the holders of such bonds; and

(g) that the seceding municipalities shall be released and discharged from all debts, liabilities and obligations with respect to the railway and railway company and in respect of their collateral debentures and certificates of indebtedness and such debentures and certificates of indebtedness shall be cancelled by the Treasurer of Ontario; and

(h) when certain debentures are delivered by Windsor to the Treasurer of Ontario the Treasurer shall cancel such debentures and shall receive such sums as are to be paid by Windsor to bring the account into balance, as provided by Bill No. 117, An Act respecting the Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolved, Mr. Doucett,

"That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund twenty per centum of the cost of the construction, improvement or reconstruction of the trunk channels of a drainage work or of embanking or pumping a drainage work, where the cost of the work exceeds $5,000, as provided in The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, as amended by section 1 of Bill No. 121, The Provincial Aid to Drainage Amendment Act, 1949, and

That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, when in his opinion two or more drainage works are so connected as to form in fact one drainage system, consider the works as one drainage work for the purpose of computing the cost of the work and making a grant thereon, as provided in section 2 of the said bill."

MR. JOLLIFFE: On what page of the order paper is this Resolution?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: In Votes and Proceedings, on the last page.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Have we had notice of it?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Oh, yes, in Votes and Proceedings.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why is it not on the Order Paper?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: It is in this morning's Votes and Proceedings. The Honourable Lieutenant-Governor has seen the original motion.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I did not know we would take up any Orders not on the Order Paper.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: It is authorizing the money, it does not affect the passage of the bill.

Resolution agreed to.

MR. KENNEDY: 45th Order.

NIAGARA PARKS ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 45th Order, House in Committee on Bill No.

89, "The Niagara Parks Act, 1949," Mr. Daley.

Section 1 agreed to.

On Section 2.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, speaking to Section 2: I do not want to labour the House on this point. Believe me, I am not doing it from a personal attitude. I do not want to re-thresh "old straw," or "wet straw," but certainly the statement was made that the current mayor of Niagara Falls would be a member of the Parks Commission. As I said, at that time, I thought it was a very fine idea. Since I have been mayor, at least three or four times during the year, I have to appoint a committee from the council and rightly so, to meet with the Parks Commission. This is necessitated by the interlocking agreement between the City of Niagara Falls and the Parks Commission. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think it was a splendid idea to say the Mayor of the City of Niagara Falls would be on the Parks Commission. I think, Mr. Chairman, we should have performance in this regard, not only a promise. Something should have been done years ago. I know the Chairman of the Parks Commission said, when he was speaking on the second reading of this bill, that I eliminated myself because I had said I did not want to be on the Parks Commission. Mr. Chairman, I have been on the Parks Commission for 9 years, and if I am not wanted on the Parks Commission I think somebody else should be there; at least the Mayor should have the right to put a representative on the council. I realize the old Act called for five or more. The new amendment is stating that the commission should consist of eight members which will eliminate the Mayor of Niagara Falls. This will hold it to 8 members, and they already have the 8. I think the Mayor should be on the Parks Commission and the government should do something about it.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member (Mr. Houck) has said, the present section and the former section, one read "not less than 5," and the other "not more than 8." There is absolutely no change there whatever. The commission did feel, and there are a great many people who feel, it would be an honour to serve on the Niagara Parks Commission, and requests are numerous, particularly from that area, therefore, we felt a commission of 8 was not unwieldy, and yet it was sufficiently large and in keeping with what it had been in the past. That is the reason that section was changed to read thus.

The City of Niagara Falls has at the moment 3 members on the Parks Commission—

MR. HOUCK: You have 3 from St. Catharines too.

MR. DALEY: Two from St. Catharines.

MR. HOUCK: Well, you are from St. Catharines.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not since he moved.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Are you not sure about that?

MR. DALEY: Well, at the moment I live in Toronto. I hope some day to return to St. Catharines. Probably I will receive some assistance from you people.

MR. HOUCK: Well, you have a farm along the boulevard there, so you really live there.

MR. DALEY: I think the City of Niagara Falls is well represented. There is at present a member of the Niagara Falls City Council on the Commission, and I am satisfied there is nothing personal regarding the hon. member (Mr. Houck) in this thing at all. The number was not made to exclude the mayor. If the Lieutenant-Governor should feel the Mayor be on there, and the city of Niagara Falls is well represented—

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend (Mr. Daley) has said there

are three members on the commission from Niagara Falls. They are on there not by the appointment of the government of Niagara Falls or the city council of Niagara Falls; they might well next year be from some other part of Ontario altogether and leave Niagara Falls without any member on the commission.

Now, putting all personal angles to one side, and I think we all can do that for a moment anyway; it seems to me a reasonable thing the Mayor of Niagara Falls—whoever that mayor may be—should automatically be a member of the Niagara Parks Commission. Niagara Falls has a lot to do with the Park, I mean there is an affinity there which we cannot and do not want to dislodge. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), in his reasonable hours at any rate, would agree that it is reasonable to say the Mayor of Niagara Falls should be on the commission. Not because it is my hon. friend (Mr. Houck). I would say the same thing if it were anybody else. But the Mayor of Niagara Falls, the office itself, should be represented on the Niagara Parks Commission.

Would not my hon. friend (Mr. Daley) agree that is a reasonable presentation?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): When you were in the government, it was entirely run from Hamilton. The hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) would be the first to agree with that.

MR. OLIVER: That is just a smart remark, that is all.

MR. DALEY: There are many municipalities along the Parkway, and if it is reasonable in the case of Niagara Falls, the same thing would apply to Niagara - on - the - Lake, Fort Erie, Chippewa—

MR. HOUCK: None of them are affected like Niagara Falls.

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): Who said the Mayor of Niagara Falls was excluded?

MR. FROST: The Mayor of Niagara Falls.

MR. HOUCK: No, I did not say that. The statement was made: "the current Mayor of Niagara Falls."

MR. DALEY: At one time, the Mayor of Niagara Falls was appointed on the commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: Automatically?

MR. DALEY: No.

MR. COX: Not that I am particularly coming to the defence of my old colleague the Mayor (Mr. Houck), because I was one time a mayor myself, but it seems to me I would have to agree with our Leader (Mr. Oliver) that it is a reasonable thing to do. I hope you will not think I am egotistical or boastful, but I think it is a recognized fact the country over that the mayor is the head of a municipality and should be recognized as such. Who would be more entitled to be on the commission than the Mayor of the great City of Niagara Falls, irrespective of who the mayor may be?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: I suggest it is the sensible and reasonable thing to do. I might go a little further. I hope you will not resent it when I say I am surprised myself you did not think of it, because it would appear to me someone might suggest that it smacks of political discrimination. Some people are very apt to suggest that. I am sure that is the last thing you would want. I will reiterate and repeat, from the mayors' point of view—and the mayors need no defence—I think that is the sensible and reasonable thing to do, particularly in the case of Niagara Falls.

Section 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. HOUCK: Hold the phone, now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Carried.

MR. HOUCK: No, wait a minute. In regard to "d," Mr. Chairman; under Section 3, regarding construction, purchase and operation of bridges; that does not pertain to the Parks Commission building, a bridge over to Navy Island or anything like that, does it? Have you anything like that in mind?

MR. DALEY: No, no. I assure the hon. member (Mr. Houck) we are not constructing any bridges of that nature. Bridges on the Parkway.

MR. HOUCK: It has been talked of, you know, for quite some time.

MR. DALEY: Oh, yes, but it is not that.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, in (e) of Section 3, about golf courses, as I understand it—and will you correct me if I am wrong—do you expect to have the 9 holes open, ready for play, shortly, and the other 9 next summer? Is that right?

MR. DALEY: That is it.

MR. HOUCK: And you are not going to make a clubhouse or club affair of this? It is going to be more or less a park course, for everybody concerned, paying a certain fee per day? Is that correct?

MR. DALEY: That is absolutely correct. I assure you of that.

Sections 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 6.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Is there any change in Section 6? Or is that just carried forward?

MR. DALEY: Unchanged in principle.

Sections 6 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 9.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, as hon. members will note, Section 9 is a new section. I object very strongly to this, Mr. Chairman, and suggest Section 9 be taken out of the bill.

As you will notice, under (2) in the last line, it gives the Parks Commission the same powers as the Lieutenant-Governor has under The Highway Improvement Act.

May I suggest a few things, Mr. Chairman, the Parks Commission could have under this Highway Improvement Act? It would—

> "Prohibit or regulate the opening into controlled access highways of private roads and entrances to premises adjoining controlled access highways;
>
> "Prohibit or regulate the use of controlled access highways by any type or class of vehicles;
>
> "Prohibit or regulate the erection and alteration of buildings or other structures upon or adjacent to highways intersecting or running into controlled access highways for a distance—"

And get this, Mr. Chairman

> "—of six hundred feet from the limit of any controlled access highway;"

Then, clause (d) deals with power lines and other lines on the property. You,

> "Prohibit and regulate in any area the offering or exposing for sale and the purchase or acquisition of produce, fruit, goods and merchandise of any kind on any controlled access highway or within 100 feet thereof."

And,

> "Generally for the better carrying out of the provisions of this Act relating to controlled access highways."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to be eminently fair with the hon. chairman of the Parks Commission (Mr. Daley) and the government as well. I realize they do not intend to abuse the powers under this Highway Improvement Act which they will have if this Act goes through as is. However, Mr. Chairman, we do not know what is going to happen in the future. We may some day get some Parks Commission that will not look with a sympathetic attitude or with a kindly feeling towards the residents along the Parkway.

I can well recall, Mr. Chairman, I

think it was back in 1931-32, when the hon. Mr. Henry was premier of the province, and on the Parks Commission, I believe he tried to get this same Act put through. We had quite a few protest meetings. We had a personal meeting with the then Premier (Mr. Henry) and he agreed to eliminate this part of the Act.

May I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, if this Act goes through, it gives the Parks Commission dictatorial, autocratic power. If I might cite an instance of the limitations which will be put upon them. Anybody along the River Road, which is now controlled by the Parks Commission—and I do not say, Mr. Chairman, they would expect to do this, but they would have the power—they can force anybody who is running a tourist home there, and most people are, to take off their tourist sign, if they are within 400 feet. They can force the hotels to take down their signs.

All up and down the boulevard from Niagara-on-the-Lake to the Falls and from the Falls to Fort Erie, which is a farming country, it places the farmer under a lot of restrictions.

Mind you, I agree with the hon. Chairman, something has got to be done in that regard, because we certainly do not want this side of the river built up the same way it is in New York State. You go over to Niagara Falls, New York, and drive to Buffalo; it is absolutely all industrial. This way we have a drive of which we can be very, very proud. There should be some restriction in that regard, but this Act, Mr. Chairman, gives the Parks Commission, as I said before, autocratic power. It practically gives them control of the whole city of Niagara Falls, and it gives them control of a lot of footage behind the boulevard property right from Lake Ontario to Lake Erie.

I am suggesting seriously to the hon. chairman of the Parks Commission, that it can operate the same as any commission has operated, and quite properly so, without number 9 in the Act. I think the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) the chairman of the Parks Commission, wants to be fair. This was not in any other Act. The last Act has not been revised since 1927. I think we have had the Parks Commission there since 1887 or 1890, somewhere back in those years, and they did not see fit to have this section in any of the Parks Act, so I suggest, Mr. Chairman, and through you to hon. members of the House, if they happened to be the mayor of any municipality, or the reeve or member of council of any municipality, and they were forced to live under this Act and under a commission, they would not look upon it with approval either.

I am suggesting and asking hon. members of the House to support me in suggesting that number 9 be eliminated from this Act.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, to hear the hon. member (Mr. Houck), it does sound as though something terrible could happen over in that area if this number 9 is left in. One thing he has overlooked is that the actual control is not in the commission, but has to be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in case there was anything drastic contemplated, or anything endeavouring to take away any people's rights.

Here is the situation over there: I, as an individual, as a life-long resident in the area, appreciate the value of that Niagara Parkway. I think it is one of the greatest attractions. The man-made beauty in connection with the natural beauty of the falls and the whirlpool is one of the greatest assets we have as a tourist attraction. I think I, as chairman of the commission, have some responsibility to endeavour to maintain that beauty.

MR. HOUCK: I did not say you had not.

MR. DALEY: I know you did not, but I mean I am not trying to be smart or anything, but I think I have a responsibility while chairman of the Parks Commission to maintain the beauty and to see that maintenance of the park and everything is in keeping with what is expected by the people.

Here is what we find and we have had it happen: that in one section some

individual will come in and will put up a little stand from which he is going to sell Coca-Cola and hot dogs or something of that nature, and first thing you know, they are encroaching on the park, or using the Parkway. Their building is on their own property, yet they use the entrance and the park land for the parking of cars. At the present time we have no authority to stop that sort of thing.

I do not think there is any thought in the minds of a single member of the commission, or any commission that might follow which would use any dictatorial aspects of this thing. It is to protect and try and maintain that as a parkway rather than allow it to become just a city street which would be no more of an attraction than driving down any other main street, except that you would have the river on one side. There is no thought in the minds of the commission of removing rights which the people of Niagara Falls, Chippewa or Fort Erie have exercised in the past. We know it is a necessity, in order to have tourists taken care of, that there must be tourist homes, and it is true that all along the river there are tourist homes and that they must have some identification indicating them as such.

There is no thought in the mind of anyone to interfere with the rights of anyone, but the situation I have mentioned does crop up and we would lack the authority to go to that person and try to influence him to do the thing we suggest would be in keeping with the general condition of the Parks.

I cannot see a bit of harm in it. If there were a commission which attempted to override and overrule the people of the district and impose on them, it is a matter for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to decide.

Sections 9 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 12.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, is (2) (a) a new power which is in this Act?

MR. DALEY: Unchanged in principle.

MR. OLIVER: (a), is that not new? It was not in the old Act, was it?

MR. DALEY: Which?

MR. OLIVER: (a) of (2), at the bottom of the page.

MR. DALEY: Oh, yes.

MR. OLIVER: That was in the old Act?

MR. DALEY: Unchanged in principle.

Sections 12 and 13 agreed to.

On Section 14.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, this Section limits the commission in the expenditure of receipts to three specific purposes.

> "Operating expenses;
>
> "Payment of interest on indebtedness; repayment of principal moneys borrowed."

Then it is provided if there are any surpluses arising from the operation of the commission, they are to be paid into The Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Regardless of whether there are surpluses or not, I am just questioning the principle embodied in this section. In Section 4, the commission has already been given the power to borrow money for the purpose of making improvements and for capital purposes, and there can be no objection to that section. However, in this section we are limiting the commission so that if substantial surpluses should arise, they cannot be used as in Section 4 for purposes of making improvements.

This year the hon. Provincial Treasurer has set us an example in that he has been using money out of revenues for capital purposes, and I am suggesting the commission ought to be enabled, if substantial surpluses should arise, to use those surpluses for the purposes set out in Section 4, as well as the purposes now set out in Section 14, that is to say, for making improvements.

If Section 14 stands as it is, it simply means that every time the commission

wants to make an improvement, or spend money for any capital purpose, it will have to borrow the money, and pay interest on that money. It seems to me illogical, if there are to be surpluses—and there might be from time to time—on the one hand to require the commission to borrow money for improvements, and pay interest on it, and on the other hand to require the commission to pay over its surpluses into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) if any consideration was given to that point, when the bill was up for consideration?

MR. KENNEDY: That is the intention of the bill, to pay off the indebtednesses out of surpluses.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I appreciate that. Section 14 specifically states that it is for operating expenses, payment of interest on indebtedness and repayment of principal monies borrowed. That is fine. I have no objection to that. But if the commission proceeds to spend money on further improvements, they cannot use money out of revenue, under Section 14; they have to borrow money under Section 4. I do not see that is of any assistance to anybody but the bankers.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, it says "operating expenses," which includes repairs, maintenance of buildings, roads, and all such things.

MR. MILLARD: It does not provide for capital expenditures.

MR. KENNEDY: Perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) would add a few words by way of explanation.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, if it is not here, what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is suggesting, is what we want in. This is the way we are doing it, and if this does not give us the authority—

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will refer the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to Section 4, which sets out quite precisely the powers of the commission to borrow money to meet its indebtedness, for the indebtedness to be incurred, for the purpose of making improvements. That is where your capital expenditures are. You will see the powers set out there other than those mentioned in Section 14.

I am glad the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) had in mind using the surpluses to improve this great asset of the Province of Ontario, but I do not think Section 14 enables you to do that. It enables you to pay operating expenses, and interest, and to retire outstanding debts, which were incurred some time ago, but as I see it, it does not enable you to spend money on new improvements. You have to borrow the money. You would have to borrow the money.

MR. LESLIE E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): What you need, Mr. Chairman, is a new Section 14, or call it "Subsection b" which will enable you to spend money on capital account and use the surpluses, if necessary. Under this bill, you have to turn the money into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and it seems to me you would not have the money for any improvements or extensions. Why should you pay the surpluses into the Treasury, and then go out and borrow money? As the bill stands now, you have put yourself in that position. Under Section 4 you can borrow the money, but under Section 14 you have to turn the money back to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. What you need is a new section, whereby money—Section 9—in the surpluses, could be retained by the Commission.

MR. H. A. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that Section 14—although I note in the explanatory note that it is unchanged in principle—is rather out of line. The hon. member (Mr. Wismer) said that any surpluses you had, you had to turn back into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. That is not the way I read it. It says:

> "Any surplus monies shall on the order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-

Council, be paid to the Treasurer of Ontario, and shall form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund."

If my memory serves me, I remember some years ago there was a considerable surplus, which was to be used for certain improvements. The Henry government of the day — and probably the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) will remember this with me—had its funds in desperate straits, and were desperately in need of revenue, and they went down and took every dollar out of the Treasury at one fell swoop. They raided it.

In a few years' time another government came in. Unfortunately we had a very disastrous — or unfortunate— decision from the Privy Council as to what we had to pay in settlement, and we did not have a dollar with which to pay it. I have always felt that any surplus funds which were secured by the Commission should be kept there for the payment of their debts, and for the beautification of the district, one of the finest in Canada; probably the most publicized and popular of any on the North American continent. You could beneficially to Ontario use the funds which may be on hand. They have a revenue of some three-quarters of a million dollars, and the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) says they intend to pay a couple of hundred thousand dollars on this old debt, which is still a millstone around their necks. I do not think this provision should be in there. By an order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, they may at any time go down and raid your till, and put it all into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, when they find they are short of money in the Treasury.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the government that this section be left over for a day or so, and let them think it over, and we could go on with the rest of the bill, and deal with this section later.

MR. NIXON: We may not always have the present hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in office.

MR. KENNEDY: I think that is a good suggestion. The committee could report on all but the last clause.

MR. FROST: I never take away; I am always giving.

Section 14 stands.

Sections 15 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 19.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Chairman of the Parks Commission (Mr. Daley) a few questions, with regard to "b," which says:

"Providing for the protection and preservation from damage of the property of the Commission."

I think I realize what is behind Section Number 19. I think it is necessary and I am sure the hon. Chairman of the Parks Commission (Mr. Daley) will agree with me that something will have to be done with the crowds we have in the parks, especially at week-ends, on holidays and for special events. I am referring to people who like to risk their lives in going over the Falls in a barrel—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Have you not stopped that yet?

MR. HOUCK: I have a few more I would like to put over, first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HOUCK: When these events take place, the people crowd to the river front, and we are very apt to have a rockslide or something like that, and have a real calamity.

Just a few days ago, a fellow had the bright idea—I do not know where he got the idea to see me, unless it was because I am the Mayor of Niagara Falls—but he had the idea to buy 8 or 10 mammoth balloons, and start them up the river, and sell lottery tickets on them, the same as they do in England.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HOUCK: He thought that we could finance a very beautiful hospital from the returns.

I think Section "b" will give you some

power to act, and take the onus off of our shoulders. I believe now there are a couple of fellows who want to walk a tightrope across the river from Niagara Falls, New York, to Niagara Falls, Ont.

In regard to Subsections "e" and "g"; what protection are you affording for pedestrians in the park? Are you only permitting the sight-seeing cabs, or will you also permit the horse-drawn vehicles? We license them in Niagara Falls. Do you intend to keep them off of park property entirely, and only use the city streets, or are you still going to allow them to go through the park?

MR. DALEY: I would say to the hon. member (Mr. Houck) I consider these horse-drawn vehicles one of the features there.

MR. HOUCK: You will not eliminate them from coming into the park?

MR. DALEY: No; we had no thought of that.

Sections 19 to 23 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 89, with the exception of Section 14, reported.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, may I thank the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) for holding this bill over for a while, inasmuch as I was not present. I appreciate it.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): 50th Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 50th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 103, "The Loan and Trust Corporation Act, 1949," Mr. Blackwell.

MR. C. C. CALDER (L London): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) would be willing to lay this bill over at least until next week. It is rather a complicated one.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): There is no objection to that.

Bill No. 103 stands.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): 51st Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 51st Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 105, "An Act to amend the Presqu'il Park Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 105 reported.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): 52nd Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 52nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 106, "An Act to amend the Long Point Park Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 106 reported.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): 49th Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 49th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 102, "An Act to amend the Wolf and Bear Bounty Act, 1946," Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

On Section 1.

MR. J. M. NEWMAN (L Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) would give further thought to increasing the wolf-bounty, instead of the bounty on wolf pups? I still maintain the farmers will be away when the wolf pups are around. It is the wolves which do the damage, and the farmer can do but very little to protect his property. I also think, Mr. Chairman, that the bear-bounty should be increased. I think increasing the bounty on wolf pups is one way of sliding around the issue, and I think in the north-western part of the province, it will accomplish nothing.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (CCF Temiskaming): I notice a bounty is paid on pups until they are three months old. How can you tell whether they are three months or over? How can you prove their age?

HON. H. R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests—Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, I will answer the second question first. The same as they always have. It has always been in the Act that way.

Referring to the remark by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Newman), the Department has been in correspondence with various states which have tried it out, and the answer is that increasing the bounty on wolves is not the answer to the problem. I have previously mentioned a situation, such as we are in, where $10 is paid in the west, and $15 in the east, and $15 in Minnesota to the south of us. There is always the possibility of an influx of wolf skins, in order to obtain the larger bounty.

I have talked with trappers up in their own area, and they did not mention wolves or bears; they mentioned bobcats. I do not know whether you are conversant with them, but they had an inrush of bobcats.

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): What kind of cats?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Bobcats. They are coming from south of the border. We discussed with these trappers the possibility of improving the condition, and asking them what they thought would be the proper answer. They pointed out that, from their point of view, bringing in adult wolves is quite a problem. They have to bring them in on a sleigh or wagon, and they have to sleep with them in their cabins every night until they thaw out, so they can skin them. They agreed with us that increasing the wolf pup-bounty would be an inducement to the trappers to stay on their trap lines a little longer in the spring, and they think, in place of getting one wolf occasionally, they might get a whole den of small wolves, either from digging them up, or because they have not yet become conversant with the wiles of escaping from traps. They thought, in that way, they could considerably increase the catch of wolves. They were willing to co-operate in every way with us, not so much from the point of view of increasing the bounty, but from the point of view of where each man has his own trapping areas, and it would be to his advantage to catch as many as possible.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (CCF St. David): Some weeks ago, a person in the United States sent me a booklet, showing methods of destroying wolves. He suggested the bounty system was not the best system. The best system would be for the province or state to employ people whose only job it would be to destroy the wolves; pay them salaries, and give them an area in which you want the wolves destroyed, and let these people become experts at destroying wolves.

I also know that in the west they used a new device very effectively for destroying wolves. It is a little gun placed in the ground, with a bait on top of it, with a special attachment on the bait, and the wolf bites it, and there is an explosion of poison, which poisons the wolf right on the spot. It very seldom gets away more than 50 yards from the trap. That is a very dangerous device to use, and a trapper might be injured if he used that particular type of wolf-trap without some experience, but I think this department might seriously consider investigating this cyanide gun, or whatever they call it, and develop a group of experts to destroy the wolves.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Use the 22 points for bait.

MR. FROST: The Tory Government would never pull such a trick as that.

MR. DENNISON: Some of those 22 points have laid around long enough that they would make good bait now. Somehow or other, if a strong enough scent could be used; in that connection no doubt the discarded 22 points might be considered.

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): Mr. Chairman, I have been in the north longer than any of you, and I have certainly learned something today. My good friend gave us an education on bobcats—I don't know what kind of cats he was talking about. My hon. friend's (Mr. Dennison) prescription for getting wolves is a new one. It reminded me of a saying: "The way to get a fox is to get some salt on the fox and you will get him." That is about as effective as

the method described. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that very keen disappointment will be felt by practically all organizations in the north in not having an increase in the bounty. I think myself that is the most effective means, and I am forced to the suggestion that his idea will defeat the very purpose we are trying to attain.

You are going to facilitate the trapping of the pups. If you kill the wolves you will not have any pups. You are putting the cart before the horse.

MR. DENNISON: If you kill the pups you won't have any wolves.

MR. COX: I have a lot of suggestions —"birth-control" of pups—to turn this into a joke. This wolf business is no joke. Had I known this was coming up, I would have brought a very comprehensive report, submitted by a very capable agricultural representative there.

I am sure the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) must know this: up until a few years ago sheep-raising was a very extensive business in northern Ontario. It was quite an industry. Thousands of sheep were being raised there only a few years ago, and, according to facts, and according to your official representative, the farmers have practically discontinued raising sheep on account of the wolves. I mentioned some time ago how numerous they are and how many the wolves are devouring. Now, my personal opinion is, in adopting your suggestion, it might create a black-market.

That might be all right out on the prairies where it is not difficult to get from Saskatchewan to Alberta or from Dakota to the Northwest Provinces, but in northern Ontario that probability is most dim. Wolves come down from the north, they do not come from the south. Irrespective of what recommendations might come from other organizations, I think a very large proportion of the tourist resorts and those associated with that, in the north, will be keenly disappointed if there is not some increase in the wolf-bounty. The apparatus may help a little, but let me suggest if you kill the pups you won't have the wolves.

MR. DENNISON: If you kill the wolves you won't have the pups.

MR. COX: Somebody will be asking which comes first, the chicken or the egg. If you kill the wolves, we won't have the pups. How is one going to determine the age of a pup? What constitutes a pup? When is a pup a pup?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): I think that is easy. Birth certificates should be issued.

MR. COX: Well, this has developed into a joke. No one questions the menace and the sincerity in trying to eliminate the wolves. My personal experience—shared by a great many—calls for an increase in the wolf-bounty.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I might say when I mentioned there would be no increase in the wolf-bounty, they did not know I was going to increase the pup-bounty, which are wolves up to three months old.

MR. MACLEOD: How can you tell when they are less than three months old?

Section 1 agreed to.

Sections 2 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 102 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: Second Order.

THE FEDERATION FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting The Federation for Community Service of Toronto," Mr. Rea.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 1 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: Third Order.

THE MOUNT McKAY AND KAKABEKA FALLS RAILWAY COMPANY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order; House in Committee on Bill No.

2, "An Act respecting The Mount McKay and Kakabeka Falls Railway Company," Mr. Cox.

MR. SALSBERG: When did that company cease to operate? Does the mover of the bill know?

MR. COX: I can answer better the other way. It never started.

MR. SALSBERG: In that case what have they to dispose of?

MR. COX: They have a few assets of questionable value. The company was incorporated about 1904, but never operated. There are several hundred shareholders and a very limited amount of assets, only a few thousand dollars, and very few liabilities. It never operated at all.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 2 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: Fourth Order.

THE INCORPORATED SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order; House in committee on Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting The Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Toronto," Mr. Rea.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 3 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: Sixth Order.

AN ACT RESPECTING THE TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough," Miss MacPhail.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 6 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: Seventh Order.

AN ACT RESPECTING WYCLIFFE COLLEGE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting Wycliffe College," Mr. Rea.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 7 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: Eighth Order.

INCORPORATED SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF ONTARIO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 15, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ontario," Mr. Stewart.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 15 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: Ninth Order.

AN ACT TO ESTABLISH THE FRONTENAC HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 8, "An Act to establish the Frontenac High School District," Mr. Pringle.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 8 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: 10th Order;

L'INSTITUT JEANNE D'ARC

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting I'Institut Jeanne d'Arc," Mr. Nault.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 9 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: 11th Order;

CITY OF CHATHAM

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 11th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 12, "An Act respecting the City of Chatham," Mr. Parry.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 12 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: 12th Order;

HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 12th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting The Hospital for Sick Children," Mr. Rea.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 13 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: 13th Order;

CITY OF BELLEVILLE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 13th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 14, "An Act respecting the City of Belleville," Mr. Sandercock.

Sections 1 to 5 agreed to.

Schedule "A" agreed to.

Section 6 agreed to.

Bill No. 14 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: 14th Order;

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 14th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 20, "An Act respecting McMaster University," Mr. Hamilton.

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 20 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: 15th Order;

ONTARIO CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 15th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 26, "An Act to incorporate the Ontario Co-Operative Credit Society," Mr. Cathcart.

Sections 1 to 20 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 26 reported.

MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report certain Resolutions and certain bills with and without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to report that the Committee of the Whole has passed certain bills with or without amendment, and certain Resolutions, and moves the report be adopted.

Motion agreed to; report adopted.

MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment of the House, it may be necessary to hold a night meeting on Monday. I am not sure but it looks as if we are dragging a little. If anyone has any objections—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I understood it was the plan to have night sessions on Tuesdays and Thursdays only. We have no objection at all to that. I would ask the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) not to proceed with a night session on Monday for a number of reasons, I do not need to go into. The only reason I give is, it is rather short notice.

MR. KENNEDY: All right.

MR. SPEAKER: Before adjournment of the House, may I draw the attention of the hon. members to the fact that in the mimeographed copies of *Hansard* of last night's proceedings the speech of the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) was attributed to the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park). This, of course, will be corrected.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): The wise cracks made by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) were attributed to the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple).

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say, if the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) wants to get on with business, we would not have any objection to meeting at 2.00 o'clock on Monday, if you want to get in that extra hour.

MR. KENNEDY: The out-of-town hon. members have left and I know some of them are not coming back too early. Perhaps, this Monday we had better meet at 3.00 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.42 o'clock p.m.

Vol. III, No. 23

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Monday, March 14, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 14, 1949

Expressions of Regret on the Death of Mr. W. B. Reynolds, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Jolliffe, Mr. Oliver, Mr. McLeod 813

Teachers' Superannuation Act, introduced by Mr. Porter, first reading 815

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading 817

Forest Management Act, bill to amend, Mr. Scott, first reading 817

Executive Council Act, bill to amend, Mr. Oliver, first reading 818

Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, second reading 819

Homes for the Aged Act, 1949, introduced by Mr. Goodfellow, second reading .. 834

The Children's Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading 840

Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, second reading 843

The Hospitals Aid Act, 1948, bill to amend, Mr. Kelley, bill reported 844

Niagara Parks Act, 1949, introduced by Mr. Daley, section 14 agreed to 845

Sanatoria for Consumptives Act, 1947, bill to amend, Mr. Kelley, bill reported 845

Succession Duty Act, 1939, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, bill reported 846

Income Tax Act (Ontario), bill to amend, Mr. Frost, bill reported 846

Loan and Trust Corporations Act, introduced by Mr. Blackwell, bill reported 847

Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to 849

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1949

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those that depart hence, we most humbly beseech Thee to look in love and mercy upon the soul of Thy child, Walter, whom Thou hast called from the cares and duties of this world, into Thine Eternal Presence. Grant that as we believe in the reality of Life Eternal, so too may we, his friends and associates, find comfort in that same knowledge for him. Graciously look upon those bereaved by their loss, and may they find in Thee—the God of all mankind, a sure refuge and strength in their time of sorrow. For all his weaknesses and shortcomings we beg Thy mercy, and through the same, may he find eternal rest in Thine unbounded love. All of which we ask in the name and for the sake of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, who is the Resurrection and the Life. Amen.

The Lord's Prayer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Members of this House have already learned, and with profound sorrow, of the passing on Saturday last, March 12th, of one of the most esteemed and beloved representatives in this Legislature. Walter B. Reynolds, affectionately known and respected as the Dean of this Assembly, carried with him an expression of the finest sense of duty, the highest quality of understanding, and the greatest evidence of charity. It would be safe to say that no Honourable Member was more beloved by all of us than the one whose seat is made vacant today.

Spared for many years to be of service to this province, he went to his eternal home in active duty. He would not have wanted it otherwise. With this keen sense of loss, there must likewise come a profound feeling of gratitude. We are all better men and women for having been privileged to know him. We will all hold him in kindly memory. We will all be thankful for his good life. As a private member of this House since 1937, and Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, as Deputy Speaker from 1943-1948, he exemplified those qualities of dignity, kindliness and generosity which will make his place difficult to fill.

We give thanks for the gift of his life to our day and generation, and commend his immortal soul to his Creator.

May we observe one minute's silence please, in grateful recognition of the life of Walter B. Reynolds.

One minute's silence; all hon. members standing.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in every man's life when he finds it impossible to put into words what his heart and mind want to say. This is one of those occasions. But, there should be no grief or sorrow in our hearts today. The joy of having known Walter Reynolds over the years, and known of his honesty, out-weighs so many times any deeper sorrow we may have now. Realizing what he has given to this province, and his honesty and desire to do good, no one could look at him without having instilled in heart and mind just what an honest man meant to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remember him as I saw him at the beginning of the session, and as long as I live I will remember him that way. May I say to those in opposition that we on this side had a gathering which was a family affair, at which our wives were present, at the beginning of this session, and at that time Walter (Mr. Reynolds) made the key speech, and I am sure every one of us who was there can see him yet, with the joy of living in his eyes, his laughter as he told story after story, of his experiences in this House, and of his happiness and joy of his public service. I see him now just as vividly as if it were only a moment ago, and that is as I wish to remember him as long as I live. We remember him for his honesty, and for the shining light in his eyes at his joy and happiness in giving service to his country.

We deeply mourn his loss, and will always have the most kindly memories of him.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, all of us here who knew the late hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) will always think of him as one of the most kindly men who ever sat in this Legislature. To some of us he became known only recently. To others of us he became known at an earlier session. I can well remember when he became Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, and Deputy Speaker, in the 1945 session of the 21st Legislature, and I can remember with what good humour, tolerance and patience he occupied the chair in which the Clerk is sitting at the moment.

I do not recall ever hearing an unkind word from the lips of Mr. Reynolds. He was a friend of all hon. members of this House, and, indeed, on more than one occasion at this very session, sincere words of greeting have been spoken from this side of the House to the oldest member of the Legislature, who sat in the first row of the government ranks, between the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Downer) and the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott, Peterborough).

We shall miss Mr. Reynolds, and shall always think of him not merely as a political opponent, but as a friend, and a kind, courteous Canadian gentleman.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I would join with the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in voicing our sympathy at the sudden passing of one who to all of us here was a true and very sincere friend.

Over the years, Walter Reynolds has been to us a symbol of what a public man should be toward the province and toward his fellow men. He held his views strongly, but he also had within that great human frame, a sympathy, understanding and a great kindness which has endeared him to us over the years.

I have always felt that I had in Walter Reynolds a personal friend, a man to whom you could talk, and who had a great gift of understanding, and a great gift of seeing other persons' point of view.

This province is the poorer because of the passing of our friend, neighbour and colleague, the late hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds).

Mr. Speaker, I want the sentiments of this group to blend themselves with the sentiments expressed by the other groups in this House, in sending to his family our heartfelt sympathy on this sad occasion.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, we, too, desire to join in the tribute which has been paid to the memory of the late Walter Reynolds, whom we, like others, had come to regard as one of the most beloved members of this Assembly. I have often heard him express the wish that he might, as he put it, "be permitted to die in harness," and I am glad for him that that wish has been fulfilled. I am glad, too, that he was able to perform his duties in the Legislature to the very last, and that he departed this life enjoying the goodwill,

the friendship and the respect of all of us, regardless of party affiliations.

We mourn his passing as a friend, and we express our sympathy to the members of the government, who have lost a valued and loyal colleague, and particularly to Mrs. Reynolds, and the other members of the family in their great sorrow.

In the passing of Mr. Reynolds, the Legislature has lost a devoted, conscientious member, and the Province of Ontario a splendid citizen.

MR. SPEAKER: There will be placed on the hon. members' desks this afternoon the following memorandum, which has to do with everyone here.

RE: MEMBERS' INDEMNITIES

The Legislative Assembly Act provides that members' indemnities and allowances "shall be paid on the thirty-first day of March in each year." In addition, the Act as amended this year, provides for advances to members totalling $90 per month for each month of the fiscal year for which indemnities and allowances have accrued.

On 31 March, 1949, each member will receive the full balance owing of his indemnity and allowance for the period 7 June, 1948 to 31 March, 1949, at the rate of $2,000 and at the rate of $1,000 per year respectively.

Each member became entitled, on 7 March, 1949, to advances totalling $810 on account of his indemnity and allowance.

In order to enable the accountant for the Legislature and the Treasury Department to make the necessary arrangements for the issuance of cheques in full on 31 March, 1949, it is necessary to make a cut-off date, after which no further advances can be made.

Therefore if any member requires an advance he may have up to but not exceeding $810 (less any advances already made) if request is made on or before Monday, 21 March, 1949.

It would be appreciated very much if the members would co-operate in this regard so that there will be no delay in the issuance of the final cheques.

Any of the hon. members who desire advances up to $810, will please make the request not later than one week from today. The full indemnity cheques will be mailed out on March 31st of this year, whether the House has prorogued or not.

May I advise hon. members please, in this regard: that applications for an advance up to $810 should be made to the Clerk of the House as soon as possible.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. S. J. HUNT (PC Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present report of the Standing Committee on Mining and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Hunt, from the Standing Committee on Mining presents the following as its report:

> The Committee begs to report the following bill without amendment, and move the adoption of the report. Bill No. 86, "An Act to amend the Mining Act."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) would explain the purpose of the bill?

MR. PORTER: I had every intention of doing so, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation is intended to replace The Teachers' and Inspectors' Superannuation Act, 1946, and will very substantially increase the whole scale of pensions for teachers and inspectors, and also provide additional allowances for those who are now on pension.

I think perhaps it would be of interest to the House if I outlined some of the main provisions of this bill, not in too much detail, but in enough to give a general view of what the changes amount to.

The main provisions of this bill provide for the following:

1. Full pensions will be paid to those who have taught for 35 years, and have retired at the age of at least 62 years. These pensions will be calculated at 70 per cent. of the average salary for the last 15 years of teaching. The maximum on these pensions will be $3,000, and the minimum $600. These pensions are also payable to those who have taught for 40 years, regardless of their age at the time of retirement.

I would like to compare this portion of the proposed legislation with the provisions of the present Act, which is now on the statute books. Under the present Act, the full pension is paid to those who have had 36 years of service, and in the case of women retired at 62 years of age, and in the case of men, who retired at 65. The new Act makes it 35 years for all of them, and sets a retiring age of 62 for both men and women.

Under the present Act the pension is calculated at 60 per cent. of the average salary for the whole contributory period. That, of course, makes a substantial difference, not only reflected by the increased percentage, but also because of the fact the pension will now be based on the average over the last 15 years of teaching, and during the last 15 years, of course, in almost all cases, the scale of salaries is very much higher than it was over the earlier period of teaching. Indeed, it is estimated in very many cases—of course it is difficult to estimate exactly the amount by which it will, over the whole board, increase pensions—it is estimated it will approximate ultimately almost double the pensions now being paid under the present scale.

Under the present Act, the maximum pension is $1,500, whereas it will now be $3,000; and the minimum is now $600. It was a rather complicated arrangement under the present Act, and as I think hon. members know, there are very many pensioners today who are getting very, very much less than $600.

2. A teacher may become entitled to a disability pension after serving for 15 years of teaching. If it is a total disability, this will be at the full rate; if it is partial disability, it will be subject to adjustment by reason of that. Also, a teacher who serves for 30 years, irrespective of age on retirement will be entitled to a retirement pension, subject to adjustment by reason of age and length of service.

On all these pensions I have just mentioned, the disability pensions and those for 30 years of service, the minimum will be $600, in all cases. The present Act, as compared with that, provides for disability pensions and pensions after 30 years of service, but of course at the lower rate. Of course, the pensions will be payable under the second provision I mentioned, at the new rate of 70 per cent.; and in connection with the 30 years teaching, those who are entitled to a pension on that basis will have it computed on the average of the last 15 years of service.

3. Provision will be made for pensions to teachers who have taught between 25 and 30 years and are at least 62 years of age at the time of retirement.

These will be payable on a similar scale, subject to adjustment for length of service. The minimum of these pensions will also be $600. The old Act did not make any provision at all for teachers who had served less than 30 years, with the exception of disability cases.

4. There will be provision for dependents' pensions for the wife and children, if there are any, of a male

teacher who dies in service or on pension, and for the children, and if there is one, a disabled husband of a female teacher who dies in service or on pension.

These pensions will be at half the rate of the teacher's pension. There was no such provision in the present Act.

5. A teacher who has withdrawn his contributions from the fund, may, in the event of his return to the teaching profession, start over again as a new teacher if he wishes, without re-establishing his credit for the previous service.

The present Act requires that such a teacher repay the contributions which he or she had previously withdrawn. This is now optional; and I might add that in computing the number of years' service for any teacher within any of these categories already mentioned, if the period of service has been broken, then the total number of actual years of service will be regarded as the years on which the pension will be based.

6. The teachers' contributions to the fund will be increased from four per cent. to six per cent. of their annual salaries.

7. The present capital of the fund, which now stands at approximately $50,000,000, will be increased by each year's operating surplus, and will pay interest at the rate of 4½ per cent. per annum, which will be paid on the aggregate by the government. The 4½ per cent. was provided some years ago on this fund, and it has been decided to maintain that interest rate all the way through.

8. In any year in which the expenditure exceeds revenue—and I may say that it will be a very long time to come—the deficit will be made up from The Consolidated Revenue Fund of Ontario.

In other words, the government underwrites the pension scheme. That is new. Under the present Act, if the fund is not sufficient to meet the claims for pension, then of course the pensions would have to be scaled down accordingly, but now the government underwrites the pensions.

9. In view of the present capital resources of the fund, which are due to some extent to the past contributions of teachers who are now on pension, those present pensioners will receive an additional $120 a year, with a minimum pension of $600.

10. The provisions of this Act will come into effect on April 1st, 1949.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MUNICIPAL ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): I move, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) give us a short explanation?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This consists of about 20 amendments to The Municipal Act, which will go before the Committee on Municipal Law.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Kelley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Forest Management Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to The Forest Management Act, to give us a little better control of the cutting operations in the woods. In the last few agreements which have been drawn, we incorporated a section whereby the department could alter or vary the cutting rates of any licensee for the

purpose of forest protection, watershed control, or scenic beauty. Rather than calling in all previous agreements and so on, we are now introducing it in the Act so it will apply to all agreements in effect.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ACT

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Executive Council Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, could we have an explanation of the bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, this proposed amendment is primarily for the purpose of clarification and the removing of any doubts that may have been in the previous legislation. It simply changes the figure "10" to the figure "8."

MR. MacLEOD: It is just "tidying up" legislation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, may I, with your permission, take this opportunity of saying that due to the large number of hon. members who will be attending Mr. Reynolds' funeral in Brockville tomorrow, it will not be possible to go ahead with the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as we had decided.

I am advised that on Wednesday the Committees on Agriculture and Fish and Game will be meeting, but that Thursday, we should be able to proceed at 10 o'clock in the morning. I think we might set that time, subject to this, that if anything transpires which makes that inconvenient for the hon. Leader of the Opposition, if he would just let me know; otherwise, we will make arrangements to go ahead at 10 o'clock Thursday, instead of tomorrow morning.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to get on with the Committee on Thursday, and I think that time should be definitely fixed now, because of the importance of having witnesses on hand.

MR. FROST: It will be.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would suggest also, the hon. chairman of the committee, in the person of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, (Mr. Frost) fix also the time for the subsequent meeting now. I am thinking about witnesses, conflict with other committees, and the arrangements of hon. members. I wish he would set it for Friday morning, as I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) knows, a valued member of the committee, the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) must be away next week, not through any fault or choice of his own, but because he has been subpœnaed to appear in other proceedings at another place. I would therefore urge the hon. Provincial Treasurer to fix the next meeting for Friday morning, which would enable my hon. friend (Mr. Grummett) to be in attendance and would also enable us to proceed further with the matter this week. We will probably be crowded for time next week as well.

MR. FROST: I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, to do that. I understand the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) suggested a meeting of The Public Accounts Committee for Friday. I think perhaps we might postpone that until the following week and proceed with the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and try to clean it up this week.

MR. OLIVER: On that point, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) will agree the meeting we might have on Friday of The Public Accounts Committee would be altogether a preliminary or an organization meeting, and from what knowledge I have of the

matters we shall discuss, it would only take a very few moments to dispose of that particular meeting. I think it would be well if we could set a time on Friday to have the organization meeting and then the full meeting could go on next week.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest a quarter to ten for The Public Accounts, and ten o'clock for the Privileges and Elections.

MR. OLIVER: I think that is all right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On Friday?

MR. KENNEDY: On Friday.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, before we leave that subject, would not the hon. Premier confirm the arrangements with regard to tomorrow and the other committees? As I understand it, the other committees are not being postponed. Is that so?

MR. KENNEDY: No, there will be committees on municipal law, private bills and fish and game, and then we will have the Budget Debate in the afternoon and evening.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): 63rd Order.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 63rd Order; second reading of Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act," Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act."

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): My hon. friend (Mr. Doucett) will say something about this, will he not?

MR. DOUCETT: I beg your pardon?

MR. OLIVER: Should not my hon. friend (Mr. Doucett) speak on this bill? It is rather an important bill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Sure he should.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The other day on introducing the bill, I gave a fairly full explanation and I will be glad to do so again.

This is a bill which was amended in 1947, and under the amendment to The Highway Improvement Act, payment was authorized to urban municipalities of the province of a subsidy equal to 50 per cent. of the road expenditure, restricted to a certain maximum expenditure in the case of each individual municipality. In the case of every city and separate town and of each town and village in northern districts, the maximum expenditure on which 50 per cent. subsidy could be paid was an amount equal to 2 mills on the municipal assessment; and in the case of each town or village. In a county, the maximum expenditure on which 50 per cent. could be paid, was equal to twice the amount of the county's road levy for the previous year.

The new legislation will remove the expenditure restrictions in all cases and, beginning with the year 1949, a subsidy of 33⅓ per cent. of approved, unrestricted road expenditure will be paid to a city or separate town, and a subsidy of 50 per cent. of approved, unrestricted road expenditure will be paid to every town and village.

Neither the municipal assessment nor the amount of the county road levy for the previous year will have any bearing on the amount of the subsidy which will be paid, so that a town or village in the county which is obliged to pay a county levy for the purpose of retiring debentures will not be penalized in any way as compared to a town or village which is not obliged to pay such a levy. The subsidy will be paid on the actual approved expenditures which are properly chargeable to road improvements under the Act.

It will be noted that the percentage rate of subsidies payable to cities and separate towns is reduced from 50 to

33⅓ per cent., and the same reduction will apply in the case of the urban townships of York and East York, but even so, on the basis of the actual expenditures made in the year 1947. With the expenditure restrictions removed, there would be an increase in the subsidy paid to these municipalities of approximately $500,000. In any case, no municipality will lose by the changes, as any loss occasioned thereby will be offset by other concessions being granted.

Another feature of the bill is the assumption by the province of additional costs in connection with the payment of extensions and connecting links on the King's Highways in towns and villages. Heretofore, in the case of a town or village having a population of not more than 2,500, the province paid the cost of a width of pavement equal to the width of the King's Highway, which is usually 20 feet. Hereafter, the province will pay for at least 22 feet of the pavement, in the case of a town, which, of course, will not be affected much by the new legislation; but we will pay up to 50 per cent. of the cost up to 33 feet in the case of a town or village having a population of more than 2,500.

That is the explanation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, at the outset, that I welcome any arrangement which will give grants to a municipality on highway expansion. I am just disagreeing with this bill on the basis of my own municipality. I want to say it appears at the moment we would be substantially better off under the new arrangement. Under the old bill we received a grant of one mill which would be 50 per cent., at least, of the amount spent. However, there is another feature which comes into this bill that gives me some concern and that is the discriminatory powers left in the hands of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett). The discriminatory power is this, that I am not just sure of what road programmes he might or might not approve, and how he would decide which municipality road programme he would approve, and which one he would not approve, or how much of that road programme he might decide to approve.

For instance, in last year's programme we knew immediately we would receive one mill, while if we had a similar programme this year, looking over the financial situation of the city and the road programme of the city, the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) might decide our expenditure is too high. He might decide to give us a grant less than we received last year, or, as I understand it, we would get at least a mill, but the point I am making is that I do not like the discriminatory powers which leave things entirely in the hands of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) as to which municipality shall get a grant. It leaves the municipality entirely at the mercy of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) and they have no idea when they submit their programme whether or not it will be approved, or how much of it will or will not be approved.

I would like to suggest that some medium of appeal be given to the municipalities if they thought, perhaps wrongly, they were being discriminated against and their programme was being cut down, and things would just end there. I think they should have a right of appeal to the Municipal Board or some agency, and their case heard and a decision arrived at as to whether or not their programme was a good one. The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) should not have the power of deciding whether it is or is not approved. I do not like that feature of the bill. I think it is much too discriminatory.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, if I might reply to the hon. member (Mr. Robinson). He seems to be drawing something out of this bill which does not exist. There is nothing in this bill —no change whatever—that would give the Minister any powers to discriminate against one or more municipalities. This Act, as far as the municipality, has been like that almost from the beginning of the Highway Improvement Act. We have municipalities, that is—townships and counties, filing with the Municipal Roads Branch an estimate of their

expenditures each year and it is passed by that Branch. That, of course, happened in connection with the towns and villages during 1948, so you have no worry whatever. I might say that the point which you have taken about any discrimination does not even exist.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this Bill No. 109, seems to be one of the three major bills reflecting the Budgetary policy, or fiscal policy of the government.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): It does not "seem to be"; it is.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I would have much to say about that but, I think, perhaps, it is better said on Bills Nos. 107 and 108. I might remark, Mr. Speaker, that all day Friday and today we seem to be operating a procedure of going backwards.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): We are in reverse.

MR. SALSBERG: I was wondering if it is a reflection of the character of the government to start at the deep end and work our way back. Today we started with Bill No. 109 instead of Bill 107.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) permit me to explain that? The reason that Bills Nos. 107 and 108 are not being dealt with today is, the government was asked to receive a delegation and were waiting until after the delegation had been received before dealing with these two bills.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the delegation arrived, and I hope many delegations will be visiting the government before these bills are brought down for second reading.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It will be a very interesting meeting.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, I hope we can listen in. I will limit my remarks to Bill No. 109. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is room for fear, not so much for discrimination, about which the previous speaker (Mr. Robinson) expressed concern, but rather about a fear of favouritism arising out of the powers which this bill grants to the government.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) this? This principle has been in effect since the—

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I have not finished my argument and the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) is starting to defend himself.

MR. FROST: May I answer your question?

MR. SALSBERG: I have not asked a question yet. If I may be allowed to finish, I would be very glad to hear the answer. I am concerned with the powers which this bill grants the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett). The explanatory note on Section 49 says:

> "Under Section 9, as re-enacted, the rate of subsidy may be followed in all cases to accord with the special local condition."

Mark that, "to accord with the special local condition."

In the bill proper are a lot of local conditions which may influence the consideration of the ministry. In the bill itself, we read the following amendment:

> "Notwithstanding Section 48, the Minister, having regard to the economic condition of the township, of the adequacy of its plan of road improvements, may direct payment to the "Township Treasurer out of funds, of such amount as he may deem requisite, provided," et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, with the experience this country has had in the Province of Quebec where the Duplessis Government embarked on a reckless policy of bribing the electorate with roads and bridges on the eve of every election, I

wonder if such undesirable developments may not take place in this province on the eve of a general or by-election, with the powers we are now giving the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett). With these powers he will be able to say in regard to the "special local conditions," that a bridge is necessary, and he has authority to pay 100 per cent. for the bridge. He may decide that in accordance with "the local conditions," such as wanting a few thousand votes, a new road or a re-surfacing job is necessary.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is an honest government.

MR. SALSBERG: He has authority to undertake that and pay up to 80 per cent. of it. That is quite a percentum, I submit. I was in a section of northern Quebec during a by-election a while ago and was amazed to see when I woke up one morning and looked out of the hotel window, machinery uprooting the main street, taking up the whole main street. They were putting up signs which read: "Road being resurfaced.' What happened was that the road was taken up in Noranda and machines were working up and down for quite a few days. They rehardened the same paving material that they had dug up. In the meantime, the by-election was over.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do you think anything like that could happen in Ontario?

MR. SALSBERG: Well, I do not know, but I do think this government is taking too many pages out of Duplessis' book.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: I am wondering whether they are not learning some election tricks from Duplessis. I think that would be very bad. Mr. Speaker, I am discussing only the principle of the bill. I want to say that the policy of sharing the gasoline tax with the municipality is a sound and good policy.

MR. BLACKWELL: Can we count on you voting against the bill?

MR. SALSBERG: I think it should be shared on the basis of—

MR. BLACKWELL: Can we count on you voting against the bill?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is very anxious to know—he repeated that very clever question more than once—whether he could count on me voting against the bill. I want to assure the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that it is not a sign of wisdom for the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to vote against his bills. We have been doing it for some time and he has been losing votes at every election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not happy with the wording of the bill. With your permission, I would like to go back to the point I want to make. I want to say, the way of dividing the gasoline tax should be a sound one and one based upon the contributions which the citizens of a community make towards that fund. In other words, a city like Toronto or Hamilton should be given, in return, certain percentages out of the gasoline tax which is derived from a given municipality. This is not a way of sharing. I am afraid it creates dangerous possibilities for bribing and corrupting elections, which I am sure, we all want to make impossible. I would like to hear more discussion on this bill before it goes through second reading, especially on the principle of it. I am surprised the other opposition groups are not asking more questions. I suggest to you that there is room for a lot of questions.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Speaker, the hon member (Mr. Salsberg) does not give them a chance.

MR. SALSBERG: There is a lot to do before we approve this bill.

MR. DENNISON: This bill is not satisfactory to a number of municipalities of this province.

MR. DOUCETT: Such as?

MR. SALSBERG: Toronto.

MR. FROST: Who?

MR. DENNISON: Let me explain. Last year you gave the City of Toronto for highways $896,000.

MR. FROST: That is pretty good.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): We had to fight like everything to get that amount.

MR. FROST: You were not here to fight.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those people who fight for something, whether I am here or not. I am not like some hon. members of the government who go to sleep.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOUCETT: I think the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) is entirely wrong. You are figuring in the wrong place.

MR. DENNISON: Let me read a little item from the *Toronto Daily Star* of the other night:

> "When Toronto wanted the province last year to give them 50 per cent. of the cost of widening University Avenue, an avenue which of all streets in this city, the Province of Ontario should pay a good share toward—"

because, after all, if we are going to brighten up the look of our Provincial House, we cannot do anything in a better way than to widen and improve the approach to it, namely, University Avenue. One would have thought, if the city of Toronto were prepared to spend money on University Avenue, the department here would have been right there with 50 per cent. of it, without any question.

> "The mayor reported the other day that when they were approached last year, the province argued that the subsidy of 50 per cent. would only apply to city streets which fitted in with the provincial good-roads system."

And the province argued for some time, I understand, before the city got the amount it required in the total grant of $896,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, of course, we had a one-mill subsidy, amounting to $914,000, or thereabouts.

Mr. Speaker, this year if you had left us on the same basis as before, the one-mill subsidy to the city of Toronto, then it would have amounted to a total of $2,133,000.

MR. PORTER: You raised the assessment.

MR. DOUCETT: May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) how he makes up the $2,133,000?

MR. DENNISON: This was prepared by the City of Toronto Finance Commissioner.

MR. DOUCETT: I think the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) is making a statement which he wants to be a statement of fact. Therefore, I think when he says the city is going to get $2,133,000, he should show us how it is made up. It certainly must not all be for roads; it must be for something else. Let us know what it is.

MR. DENNISON: All right. But because you have changed the basis of that grant, we stand to lose, in the overall picture, $267,000.

Now, let us take the basis on roads alone. This year, under the present arrangement, we estimate we will get $1,300,000? Correct?

MR. DOUCETT: Is that not an increase over last year of $500,000?

MR. DENNISON: All right. That is an increase over last year, but because you changed the basis of that in-

crease, we, on the whole picture, will lose $267,000.

MR. FROST: How do you make that out?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let him finish.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, how did the larger urban centres get these grants in the first place? Let us go back to the beginning of these grants. When the Dominion Government retired from the field of the gasoline tax, the Province of Ontario accepted a very lucrative source of revenue, namely, the 3 cents per gallon tax on gasoline, which I understand at the present time brings in to the provincial revenue, in the Highways Department, approximately $12,000,000. All right. With $12,000,000 available to assist municipalities—and that was the reason given for continuing to impose this burden on the automobile drivers of this province—you now start changing the basis, and giving—neither in the Budget speech nor by the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) this morning, no logical reason for that change. If you are trying to aim this at the City of Toronto, and trying to prevent one particular city, or two or three particular cities from getting more than you think they should get, why do you not say so? Give us a reason for this change. By that change we stand to lose. The grant is lower than it was last year. Last year you gave us 50 per cent.; this year you are going to cut that grant down to 33⅓ per cent. Why the change? Why cut down the grant? You have $12,000,000 in your pocket, but you are only going to hand out a small fraction of that $12,000,000. You are collecting that $12,000,000 this year under false pretences, Mr. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett).

MR. DOUCETT: Prove your case. You know that is an absolute falsehood.

MR. DENNISON: You are assisting municipalities to build highways inside their boundaries, and yet you are only using part of it, and throwing the rest of it into the Provincial Treasury. Why do you not throw it back to the motorists, as has been done in some municipalities, by lowering the tax and licence fees?

I think this is very serious, Mr. Speaker. I think the government should seriously listen when you have deputations from the municipalities, as you will have in the next few days—

MR. BLACKWELL: Are you going to organize them?

MR. DENNISON: I think you should seriously listen to their plea, and give the gasoline tax to the municipalities who have been battling for a share of it for years.

MR. FROST: Now when you are getting it, you are kicking about it.

MR. DENNISON: We want the whole share, not just part of it. When we are just on the threshold of getting the 3 cents a gallon, you take it away from us. Saskatchewan turned over the whole 2 cents per gallon, which they took from the Federal Government.

MR. PORTER: That is only 2 cents.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) that we are turning the whole 3 cents back to the municipalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear hear.

MR. DOUCETT: And these figures were shown in this House, when the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) was out, doing something else.

MR. FROST: Out electioneering.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker—

MR. DOUCETT: I have the floor, and I will finish.

MR. DENNISON: You do not know—

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MILLARD: You do not pay the same attention when we have the floor.

MR. DOUCETT: Oh yes, I do.

MR. MILLARD: Oh no, you do not.

MR. DOUCETT: You had the floor for two hours the other day, and I do not think anybody interfered with you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: I thought they were very well received.

MR. SPEAKER: We are beginning to get a little bit out of hand. There has been a certain amount of crossfire which, as I have said before, I am glad to allow, but if the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) wishes to ask a question, and the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) is willing to answer, under the rules of this House, the question can only be asked if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) resumes his seat.

I do not want hon. members to tell me how to preserve order. I shall do it, or we will get some other Speaker who will. I will not have hon. members giving orders to the House when I am sitting in the chair.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) has the floor, and if any hon. member in the opposition wishes to ask a question, and the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) is willing to accept the question, that is entirely up to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett).

MR. DENNISON: Give us the figures, and we will get the gasoline tax.

MR. DOUCETT: I asked the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) for some figures, Mr. Speaker. He was reading from an editorial in which it was stated that the amount which the City of Toronto would get would be $2,133,000. Then the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) said the amount they would be short from last year's grant was $267,000.

MR. DENNISON: That is the over-all picture.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, the over-all picture. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) I want to tell him that the City of Toronto is going to get from the Department of Highways more money, by a long way, than they did last year, and if the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) will only keep patient for a little while, I will enlighten him and the other hon. members of the House, on what they are going to get; that is, if it is possible for the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) to keep calm for a little while, and just wait.

MR. DOWLING: Give us the figures.

MR. DOUCETT: I will deal with the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Dowling) in a little while.

MR. DOWLING: You are perfectly welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DOUCETT: In 1944 the city of Toronto received the full 50 per cent. on two-mills expenditures, which was $896,678.59. Again, a like amount was paid to the city of Toronto last year.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Toronto and the Department of Highways, to the best of my knowledge and belief, has never had any problem nor any trouble in getting their expenditures approved. We have had the most friendly and agreeable relationships between the city and the Department of Highways, as we have had with over 300 units with which we deal throughout the Province of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to show what the city of Toronto will get this year; according to their estimates—they may vary some—instead of spending $2,095,000, as they did in 1948, with an approved expenditure of $1,793,000, they anticipate they are going to spend $3,500,000 in construction in the year 1949, and $1,300,000 in maintenance, which makes a total of $4,800,000. 33 per cent. of that would bring, in round figures, $1,600,000, which the Department of Highways will be paying the city of Toronto this year, and that is an increase of 600 and some thousand dollars over last year. If you take that amount from the figure which you have quoted, it would leave only

$532,000, and I am sure you will get that from other subsidies, and other grants, and more.

MR. DENNISON: Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) promising to approve the whole amount of $1,600,000?

MR. FROST: Provided they meet the requirements.

MR. DOUCETT: I think the people repudiated the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) at the city council, and said, "We do not want you any more," and they established a new budget, and it is that new budget with which we will be dealing, and I am satisfied they will be perfectly contented about it.

Now, answering the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) may I say that never until this year did he have an opportunity of getting some subsidy and some streets built in his community—

MR. SALSBERG: Constituency.

MR. DOUCETT: This Act is broad, but it certainly does not include any changes such as those which he has suggested. After years and years, there has been a provision in the Highway Improvement Act, whereby municipalities could be granted subsidies on a sliding scale. At the present time, we have the basic rate of 50 per cent. Municipalities which have a very low assessment and large mileage get up to as high as 80 per cent. for road expenditures. Other rural municipalities in the Province of Ontario, for the last two years at least, have got 80 per cent. of all bridges and culverts. In some places in Northern Ontario—and I am sure the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) will know of these in his territory—it is utterly impossible for a community to contribute even 20 per cent., so, in those cases, it is within the Act in our power to construct a structure and pay for it 100 per cent. There is nothing funny about it. There is nothing sinister. And I may assure the hon. members that as long as I administer the Department of Highways, I do not expect we will need to go out and buy votes, such as the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) suggested, because if we do have to, we will be willing to get out, after doing a very fine job, such as we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett)?

Do I gather that the government will limit itself to grants to universities on the eve of elections, but not bridges? Just universities?

MR. DOUCETT: That is not in the Highway Act.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) a question? Is there any thought of giving additional assistance to unorganized territories? They pay the gasoline tax, too.

MR. DOUCETT: I presume you are now talking about unorganized townships?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

MR. DOUCETT: We cannot do more than we have done for them, or are doing at the present time, which is 100 per cent.

MR. FROST: Do you want us to pay more than 100 per cent?

MR. GORDON B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Speaker, it appears the Department of Highways is playing favourites here, and I would not be alarmed if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) arose and told me my figures are wrong. But I do want to quote from the *Windsor Star,* in connection with the subsidy as it affects the City of Windsor. In the year 1947 the city received a subsidy of 50 per cent, totalling $107,000. As I understand now—and I am informed by the columns of the *Star*—under this bill they will be receiving only a total of $70,000. I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to tell me that I am all

wrong, and that my source of information is wrong, and we are not going to get that cut.

I would like to say this in respect to this grant; the policy which has been followed, but changed from year to year, is that the government is leaving the municipalities in a very bad way, insofar as trying to operate from year to year on the budget they have passed for that year. My own opinion is the government is trying to help the municipalities, but where they think the conditions warrant the municipalities being cut, they are cutting them, and if they continue to do so next year, and the year after, it will lead to cutting them down, and eventually wiping them out, and I feel that is not the right policy for the government to take. I would like to say that I would be very happy to forget all about these road subsidies, and all the others which have been offered, the police department subsidy, the fire department subsidy, and all those, if the government will come through and take over 50 per cent. of the cost of education in the City of Windsor. But in view of the fact that apparently there is no possibility whatever of that, I would suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that he kindly tell me if the figures I have quoted are wrong, and we will not receive a reduction of this grant this year, under this bill.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say, Mr. Speaker, in replying to the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) that it all depends on the amount of money which the city spends in the year 1949. If they spend a large enough sum, they will get more than they did last year. If their expenditures are down, the grant will be lower. Last year the subsidy was the same as the year previous; this year it will be based on the expenditure. I have some resolutions in my office from urban municipalities, and especially from the smaller villages and towns, who petitioned the department for the change. If they wanted to build a main street, or a mile of pavement, within the corporation, under the former Act they would get but a small amount, probably 20 per cent. or 25 per cent. of their expenditures; now they can build the street, and they can get the full share, 50 per cent, in the one year, and then they can ease off the next year. Formerly that could not be done, under the former Act. If the municipality built, say, two miles of paving, they probably had to carry 70 per cent. or 80 per cent., or perhaps even 90 per cent, of it themselves.

In one municipality in the County of York, I think they will make an increase in their debenture debt this year of nearly $20,000. In regard to the towns and villages in the organized counties of Southern Ontario, if the county council saw fit to debenture a certain amount of their road expenditures, again the village and town within that county had to pay their share. They were refused a subsidy under the former Act. This Act permits them to get the full 50 per cent. of their expenditures, regardless of what the county councils are spending, and regardless of whether it is debentured or not. I think the majority of the municipalities will approve of the present amendment most heartily. In fact, approval has already been voiced in many quarters of the Province of Ontario.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) a question: Taking his figures, last year $793,000; which was paid to the City of Toronto; this year $1,600,000—

MR. DOUCETT: How much was approved?

MR. DENNISON: Last year $793,000.

MR. DOUCETT: No, $1,793,357.18.

MR. DENNISON: That was the approved expenditure?

MR. DOUCETT: That is right.

MR. DENNISON: Now you paid over that expenditure $896,000—

MR. DOUCETT: $896,678.59.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, that leaves a difference of approximately $700,000. In view of the fact—

MR. DOUCETT: $700,000—what?

MR. DENNISON: That leaves an increase in this year of under $700,000. In view of the fact that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) has only budgeted according to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) $700,000 for the whole province, the City of Toronto will absorb the whole amount granted for the whole province. How will you get the money to pay the other municipalities, to which you are going to give increases? You only have $700,000 increase—

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, remember we have over 1,339 municipalities and units which get assistance from the government. No person has said in this House that in the budget 1,339 are going to be over last year's expenditures, and I hope they will not be. In fact, some municipalities have indicated they desire a reduction. The over-all picture may be correct, but it does not concern every municipality.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, before we leave this bill, will the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) indicate just what he is estimating for the total grants under this bill, if it becomes law, because it is not clear from the hon. Minister's (Mr. Doucett) own estimates what he has in mind in the way of grants.

I suppose he will say it is not $700,000, but let us know just what it is before we pass this legislation.

MR. DOUCETT: It may be anything up to a million or more. We are not sure. Those are the figures. I said we had an estimate from the city of Toronto. I am not positive that is what they are going to spend, and until we get their appropriations we are not in a position to say definitely what they need.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I am not asking the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to prophesy or say definitely what it will be, I am asking a Minister of the Crown what he estimates it will be. If he has no estimate, he is certainly very much at sea in the matter. I am asking for an estimate not a prediction as to the exact or definite amount. We understand, of course, that will not be known for some time, but nobody can tell me a budget has been prepared without making an estimate of what the financial liabilities are going to be under this Act as amended.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, as I believe I said the other day, it would be about $700,000.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. DOUCETT: Additional, you see.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Additional, under this Act?

MR. DOUCETT: Additional, yes. I think those are the figures I gave. It may be up a little or down a little.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): But the city of Toronto will get $703,000—$3,000 additional if it chooses.

MR. DOUCETT: No one said $703,000.

MR. DENNISON: That is the difference between the figures.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) said 600,000 and something.

MR. DOUCETT: That is an estimate. They can get that, and they can get more.

HON. THOMAS L. KENNEDY (PC Premier): Mr. Speaker, I think we are getting into committee stage. This is getting into a debate now.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might re-phrase an important question to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett)? The question I was trying to ask was, is it the intention to increase the grant to the Statute Labour Boards?

MR. DOUCETT: This is another question.

MR. ROBINSON: No, that is the question I should have asked. I did not phrase it clearly enough.

MR. DOUCETT: No. We made a decided increase to Statute Labour Boards a couple of years ago and are not proposing at the present time to make any change in that set-up, as it is fairly flexible and, I think, fairly satisfactory.

MR. WISMER: It has developed since this new change in relationship between the province and the municipalities was first indicated to the House at the time the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) brought down the Budget. I think that whole development has been one of indicating some blind groping by the government. It becomes more and more obvious from where we sit here that they are not quite sure where they are headed. There seems to have been some desire, to give all credit to the government, to change the relationship with regard, for instance, to these highway grants, in such a way the municipalities would do a little better.

MR. FROST: They will do better.

MR. WISMER: Well, that is not obvious.

MR. FROST: Very considerably better.

MR. BLACKWELL: It is obvious by $700,000.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Speaker, we have sat here pretty quietly while the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) attempted to explain his position. I think it is important that some of these things be said. In the first place, it was not obvious when this Legislation was first suggested, that it was going to be 1949 road operations, road building.

MR. DOUCETT: What is that again?

MR. WISMER: It was not obvious to any of us in the House, I am sure, when this legislation was first suggested by the hon. Provincial Treasurer and when the bill came down, introduced by the hon. Minister of Highways, that the new grants as covered in the bill of 33 ⅓ and 50 per cent. were going to be applied to 1949 municipal expenditures.

MR. FROST: Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) know that applies under the Highways Improvement Act? It has applied for years and years with regard to the great majority of municipalities in Ontario, and all this does is to make it apply now to urban centres and cities. What is wrong with that? That has been done for years.

MR. WISMER: We do not need to be instructed by hon. Ministers what is in the Act. We are quite capable of reading Acts, even ones prepared by this government.

MR. BLACKWELL: You just said you were confused.

MR. FROST: You told us you were confused.

MR. BLACKWELL: You should be grateful.

MR. WISMER: For the first time we have found the government is prepared to ask this Legislature for a blank cheque.

MR. FROST: Oh, nonsense.

MR. WISMER: They have not the slightest idea what this is going to cost.

MR. FROST: Nonsense.

MR. WISMER: Well, now I will give you an idea of how little information you have as to what this is going to cost. You put in the Budget an increase of $700,000.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, can I clarify this with my hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) to take him out of the fog in which he is groping?

The fact of the matter is that $700,000 in the Budget was calculated on the expenditures of 1948, the last available expenditure. It is the same as with

the other 900 municipalities in Ontario; the road programmes are sent in and they are approved and the subsidy is paid on the current year's expenditures. It may be, just as the hon. Minister of Highways said, some municipality may be up and some municipality may be down, but the level, Mr. Speaker, will probably work out around about $700,000 more than last year. That is the story and there is no mystery about it. That situation has been working in this province for 20 years, and there is no difficulty with it.

MR. WISMER: Very well, he says there is no difficulty with it. He worked out his expenditures on last year's work.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. WISMER: And according to the hon. Minister of Highways' own figures, given in the last few minutes in this House, just about the whole of the $700,000 is taken up in the change in the City of Toronto grant. Let us not "kid" ourselves about that. You cannot take credit for one and say: "We are going to increase the grant by $600,000," and in the next breath say: "We have not done it." You have. It is done. Surely the government is not prepared now to rise and say every municipality in the province is going to take a cut, because that is exactly what would have to happen, to almost all of them, in order that your $700,000 would be anywhere near right.

Let us be honest about these things. The fact is we are starting out on a new relationship with regard to road building which may be a perfectly good relationship. It may be all right, but we are just starting out with the same thing I condemned the government for a few months ago, in suggesting that all they need in their estimates is another $700,000, asking this House for authorization for that $700,000, which the House will give, I suspect, and coming back a year or more afterwards to show us that it did not cost $700,000, but it cost a million or a million and a half—who knows? The municipalities are going to control the expenditure. If we believe what the hon. Minister of Highways says, he is going to approve all their expenditures. This, then, is the controlling factor on the Treasury of the province in this relation. I do not think it is good.

MR. FROST: They have never been, to date, anyway.

MR. WISMER: I do not think the province should be put in a position to arbitrarily go in and control a municipality. I am equally opposed to the funds in the treasury of this province being, not spent under the authority of the House and the government, but being expended as simply a percentage of a total of municipal highway expenditures. There is no responsibilty. How can any man, or any government, actually say it will take responsibility for that sort of thing? It is a blank cheque. It is not prudent.

While I am on my feet, I would like to point out that the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) says there is no new principle in this bill, but there is.

MR. DOUCETT: I did not say any such thing.

MR. WISMER: It says all the way through the bill, Mr. Minister, that there is no new principle. But there is in effect something new here, and it is this—

MR. BLACKWELL: The new look.

MR. WISMER: Yes, the new look. The language of the bill is purely discretionary. There is no obligation to pay. It may very well be, as the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) said, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities will send in their road-building-maintenance programmes, and ask for and get approval and get the money without any more difficulty than there has been on any such relationship in the past; that this whole new set-up will work just as well; but the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that what the Legislature is required to give effect to, what it is being asked to enact is that the hon. Minister "may" do this and "may" do

that and may do something else, but nowhere in the Act does it say he "shall" do anything.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago, my hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) was saying that the municipalities were "calling the tune" and we had to pay what they said. Now, he is turning around and saying there is no obligation on our part to pay at all. Just what does he mean, anyway?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WISMER: That is exactly where I started out, the government is not obligated to do anything. The "fogs" they say are on this side, there are "smogs" over there.

MR. FROST: This plan is one which has been used in Ontario for years. It has worked and it is working well, and all my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) has to do is come down to one of the Good Roads Conventions, which are held in this city every year, and find that the people of the province are satisfied with this system, and that it is working satisfactorily. What we are doing is; we are applying this system as the cities and towns as requested by them, and it will work with them just as well as it will with the others. There will be no difficulty in dealing with the City of Toronto in a common-sense way than with the Township of East Gwillimbury. There is not a bit of difference. I imagine the York council will be just as easy to deal with as they are.

MR. WISMER: I am sure the city council—

MR. FROST: No use getting yourself into a fog about this thing. There is no fog about this; it is clear enough.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We will see who is in a fog.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Speaker, I am sure hon. members of the House must enjoy the instruction I get from day to day from the government.

MR. FROST: You certainly need it now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WISMER: I accept it all with thanks, but I am coming back to make my point.

MR. BLACKWELL: When? This year?

MR. WISMER: That will be too soon for the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). The legislation neither protects the treasury nor the municipalities, nor is it drawn in such a way that what has to be done under it can always be done, and I suggest that is not the reasonable, responsible type of legislation to be put before this House. I think the government should know better where it is going, what it is trying to do and how it wants to do it, before it brings down this kind of legislation and asks for approval of it.

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I have been wondering what we have been talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: In my long years of experience in municipal affairs—and I am not taking sides—it is most difficult for municipalities or for anyone else to pre-determine the exact amount of money which is going to be expended. There is a great deal of fluctuation when the estimates are made and what the ultimate amount will be.

MR. DOUCETT: That is right.

MR. COX: I do not know how anybody can tell at this time what the ultimate amount of expenditure will be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, before we leave this matter, let us see who is confused about the question.

MR. FROST: Surely you are not mixed up, too, are you?

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues can possibly restrain themselves for a record-breaking five minutes, I am going to analyze the remarkable remarks a little while ago of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett). He said that last year the provincial contribution to Toronto in this connection was $896,678.59. He said that was based, of course, on previous expenditures, but this year they have plans—the exact total, of course, is not known—for an expenditure of $4,800,000. Under the new Act, the provincial contribution would be one-third or 33⅓ per cent., and 33⅓ per cent. of $4,800,000 is $1,600,000. The difference between $896,678.59 and $1,600,000 is considerable, and it happens to be an increase of more than $700,000 with respect to the City of Toronto alone.

Then, when we ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) just what he is estimating by way of a total increase in the province for the year under the new Act, he says: "We are estimating an additional $700,000," and in almost the same breath he reminds us there are many hundreds of municipalities in the Province of Ontario which will qualify.

Now, I realize the hon. Minister may need some help on this thing in view of what he said to us, but the point is if on your own figures the increase in your contribution for the City of Toronto alone will exceed $700,000, what is the sense of telling us the estimated increase for the whole province is going to be $700,000? That just does not add up.

MR. FROST: Oh, yes, it does. Of course it does.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has not been listening to what I have been saying.

MR. FROST: I have been listening to every word.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will, therefore, explain it to him in words of one syllable.

MR. FROST: I heard it. You said exactly what my hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) said.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I have not said what anybody else said before. What I pointed out was what the hon. Minister of Highways himself has told us that Toronto's estimated expenditure is going to be $4,800,000. One-third of $4,800,000 is $1,600,000, and that is more than $700,000 greater than the provincial contribution to Toronto last year, and you are only allowing for a $700,000 increase in the budget.

MR. FROST: All right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: For the whole province? How does that make sense?

MR. FROST: It makes sense in this way, the earned part of that is being capitalized by the City of Toronto.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has a better explanation to offer than the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), let us hear it. I would like to hear it.

MR. FROST: Part of it is being capitalized, and of course the province's share will be paid as and when it is due, as time goes along.

Of course, it will be paid for, but actually speaking the province will assume its share of that indebtedness and its share of the expenditures.

Furthermore, I may say that just as my hon. friend for Fort William (Mr. Cox) says, after all, the great brake on this thing is the people of Ontario, the people of the municipalities. No city or town is going to go out and spend money foolishly, because their taxpayers have to pay for it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Nobody is suggesting that.

MR. FROST: That is the greatest brake there is. It lies in the municipalities of Ontario. That has been experience; and our estimates are, based on last year's expenditures, which were large, heavy expenditures in the

Province of Ontario. This will run to about $700,000 more money. We were very close to it two years ago when we entered into the initial stages of this scheme, on the balance of 1947. We were very close to it and we will be very close to it this time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I do not want the hon. Provincial Treasurer to misunderstand me. Nobody has suggested the municipalities are going to embark on a reckless spending spree because of this legislation. As a matter of fact, most of us welcome one of the principles at least of this legislation, and certainly those of us who travel the highways a great deal hope it will encourage some municipalities to make those connecting streets which pass through certain municipalities more passable and less damaging to through traffic, than some of them have been in the past.

We are not quarrelling with the principle of giving more assistance to municipalities in the interests of better roads and better transportation, but we do want to be clear about what is being done. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has said seriously, that he estimates the additional costs of the coming year will be $700,000. I will accept his word that that is a bona fide estimate. I hope it will be closer than the highways estimates were a year ago, that is all. They were, I think, about $8,000,000 out last year, maybe for good reasons, but—

MR. FROST: They got value for their money.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If it is a serious bona fide estimate, we will make a note of it "on the cuff" as the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) says, and see what it looks like a year or two from now.

I simply want to conclude by pointing out that nobody has quarrelled with the principle of more adequate assistance to municipalities which have well-considered projects for road and street improvements. There has been a question raised about the way in which the discretion of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) is going to be exercised. It may be said the discretion of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) has never been exercised for political or electoral purposes, and that it never will be, and that all these warnings of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) are unfounded. However, if there is no danger of that discretion being exercised for political purposes, then I wish the government would stop saying in by-elections, in effect, that it has been exercised in favour of one constituency or another.

MR. FROST: We never said that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I suggest in future they restrain themselves when issuing campaign literature and avoid giving the impression they have gone to great lengths to give special grants for the assistance of the particular district in which they happen to be seeking votes at the moment.

In conclusion, the other comment I have to make on this bill is that of course it has to be considered up to a point in relation to the other municipal bills which were referred to in the budget. It is after all—certainly from the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) point of view—part of a pattern. These bills are not unrelated. I think he will agree with that statement, but there is, I think, an important difference between this bill and almost all of the others, in that provincial assistance for road purposes is not new. I will go along with the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to that extent. We have been assisting the municipalities for a long, long time in the matter of roads, and there is, I think, an important distinction between that kind of assistance and some of the other assistance which is being proposed in connection with other legislation.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I do not like to prolong this discussion, but I would like to say in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe)

that as far as estimates are concerned, when this estimate was made, I did not have the figures which I gave regarding the City of Toronto. A lot of figures of appropriations for this year, we have not received as yet.

These figures in the bill are the last available figures which we could get. It is quite true that I have in my estimates, figures which we approved last year on a bridge for Sydenham at Wallaceburg for some $500,000, but they are unable to complete it. These things happen and other municipalities must have bridges built. I think the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) put his finger on it when he said it is difficult for any corporation to say exactly what they are going to spend in a year.

MR. COX: I was just going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think there is any one municipality in Ontario which knows how much it is going to spend. Tax rates are usually set about six times and expenditures are usually based on what amount was expended last year. There is a greal deal of fluctuation. There is one point which may be discussed in this bill, that which gives alloted power to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett). However, in this case, he is a pretty decent sort of fellow and we have nothing to fear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: It seems to me that we have had a lot of unnecessary talk and wasted a lot of unnecessary time and there is no way of anyone finding out how much money they are going to spend in a year.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: I do not wish to cut the debate off, but I do think we are getting rather far afield. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in summing up the case for the opposition has, more or less, completed the discussion on this bill. I do not want to cut the discussion off—

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, my question will be very brief.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. MILLARD: I just want to ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) what takes place in the case of an emergency building programme for municipalities. I am thinking about unemployment for certain municipalities. If certain municipalities undertake a road building programme as an unemployment project doing some construction work, rather than what we used to do, how will that be affected by the provisions of the present bill?

MR. DOUCETT: All expenditures made by municipalities must be done after consultation with the Department of Municipal Affairs for the appropriation.

MR. ROBINSON: Could I ask one further question? Is it the intention to amortize one-third? In the case of my municipality that one-third would be amortized over the life of the debentures. Would you cover that?

MR. DOUCETT: Pardon?

MR. ROBINSON: I understood you to say in replying a moment ago that the grant would not be made in a lump sum, it would be amortized?

MR. DOUCETT: We will pay you the 33⅓ per cent. this year.

MR. DENNISON: That was not what you said.

MR. FROST: That is discretionary.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 64th Order.

HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 64th Order; second reading of Bill No. 110, "The Homes for the Aged Act, 1949," Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 110, "The Homes for the Aged, 1949."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) would speak, otherwise I feel I should say something about it. I would rather the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) speak first.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, in all friendliness to the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow)—I do not want to be offensive about it—I do think, when a Minister of the Crown introduces a bill, he should speak in support of that bill.

MR. BLACKWELL: He has not had a chance, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) was on his feet before he had a chance.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I disagree. This sort of thing has happened too often. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) should speak. It may be that he will speak so well that no one else will want to say a word.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, I made a full and comprehensive outline of what I proposed in this bill the day the Budget was brought down. I might elaborate on it some but I think I have already covered most of the important features of it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will you permit me to suggest that what is needed is not an explanation of what is in the bill but some cogent reasons why the bill should be passed.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, in bringing forward this bill at this time, I would say the secondary reason was because of the insistent demand on the part of the municipalities for relief from social services to be charged to real estate in this province. The primary reason for bringing forward the bill at this time is to go forward with a comprehensive plan, for the building of proper institutions and providing institutional care for the aged citizens of this province. In the last three years I have visited a great many of the existing public institutions in the province. Some of these institutions are good, some are fair and some are very bad. In my opinion, in respect to the care of aged people, we must have more public accommodation for these people. I think the hon. members of the House will agree with me that it is desirable that people should live in their own homes, if possible; that is possible where they have homes of their own or where they have friends or relatives with whom they might live in their declining years. There are, however, a great many people who have no relatives or friends who will take care of them in their time of need, and therefore I feel it is necessary that we have more public institutional care for these people. There are many municipalities in the province at the present time which have no accommodation whatever for aged people. I speak, particularly, of that part of northern Ontario which one might say, at the present time, has been a young country with young people. However, they have an ageing population and are confronted with the problem of providing accommodation for these aged people who require public assistance. There are in this province, in addition to existing county homes, a great many private institutions. There is a great deal to be said for private institutions. I feel there is a place for private institutions as well as public institutions. It is my opinion that private institutions should not be subsidized by the government but I do think it is right and proper that this government, in order to encourage municipalities to go forward with a period of constructing institutions, we should offer them further assistance. The need is great with an increasing ageing population, there is bound to be need for more accommodation.

What we propose in this legislation, by offering this extra inducement, not only on capital grants on construction

but also in assuming 50 per cent. of the maintenance cost, we hope it will encourage municipalities to go forward with the right type of construction.

In the past three years, it has been my privilege to visit some of these institutions, some as I said before some good, some fair and some not so good. The one thing which occurs to me most forcibly is the need for segregation in these homes for the aged. What we visualize in this programme in providing public accommodation is a place where no one will be "committed," but they will be of a type that people, in their declining years, will be glad to go to seek shelter and care. I think that is highly desirable. We must have segregation of the different types of public institutions, create an atmosphere where people would be pleased to seek shelter and get care in their declining years.

At the present time—and I think a great many members in this House will agree with me—there are a great many people who have been hard-working, highly-respected citizens of their communities. However, through adversity—and no one knows where adversity will strike through sickness and so on—they have been placed in these homes. Some of them are placed with people who are senile and people who have a low I.Q. In the same room you will find bed-ridden old people and in a great many institutions of this type you will find there is no accommodation for an old person to die by themselves. This is not only bad for that individual but, also, for those in the room who must witness an old friend who has been with them for some time passing away and wondering when their time will come. I think, in this programme, we should do something to assist people in the construction of these new homes with new ideas.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister—

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I will gladly yield—

MISS MACPHAIL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) can assure us that the new ideas are to be incorporated in these old peoples' homes, I would be most happy to vote for that bill. I have visited some of these Homes and have come away very sad. I have seen people whom I have known very well, and when I visited them I was not allowed to see them except under supervision. The superintendent "stuck around" all the time. I do not think the superintendent should have been there. It did not make any difference to me, but I felt it did affect the enjoyment of the visit for the old person who is in the Home. I find, too, that old couples are separated. I am talking about the Grey County Home, with which I am most familiar. They are separated and possibly do not see very much of each other again. I think that is a cruelty and ought to be stopped.

I think, too, if the government is going to pay 50 per cent. of the maintenance that they should be sure the food standards come up to a reasonably good level. I do not know anything about the present time but I do know that in the 30's, they only got butter three times a week. This was in Grey County where butter was a drug on the market. That may not be true now, it is not the same superintendent, but that should not have happened at all, when Grey County farmers had more butter than they knew what to do with. There was no reason for these people going without it. There should be some sort of standard for the food.

There should also be an acknowledgment of the right of these old people to enjoy the last years of their life. There should be decent things for reading, and perhaps some crafts of a simple nature. Most recreation for older people is work of some sort with which they are familiar. I find in most old peoples' homes which I have visited, they have nothing that is amusing or interesting for them to do. I am a very impatient sort of person and if I have to put in a few hours with nothing to do I just get irritable, and hard to get along with. I do not want these people in the homes

to be hard to get along with. There is nothing to amuse them or interest them. They just sit around and wait for death, which is not a very happy prospect—unless death is a happy prospect. Waiting must be very hard for them.

I think, if the province is going to pay 50 per cent. of the maintenance and, also, assist in the construction, they should see that something should be done about the comfort and privacy of the people who are going to be in there. They should have some privacy. It is a terrible thing to end one's life in a room with a great many other people. I have thought some provision should be made for the married couples so that when they come to a Home they are not separated. I do not see why it would not be possible to give them accommodation where they can at least visit each other.

If the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) can assure us that they are going to make a study to build proper Homes, which takes into consideration the needs of the people who are going to be in there; then, I for one am "all for it." However, I do not want to see any more places built which are just places where you put old people away to die. In that case, the sooner they died the better and, perhaps, if they were left on the street they would die sooner.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) that what she has outlined is exactly what we have in mind. I pointed out when I was speaking about this bill before that segregation was an important angle of it. To my way of thinking it is most unfair and yet I see in some institutions at the present time, old couples have to be separated. I think in the new institutions there will be rooms provided within the institution where old couples can live by themselves and, better still, we hope as we go along with this programme, there will be small cottages spring up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GOODFELLOW: These cottages will be places where elderly couples can live by themselves and yet they will get care if necessary. On that point, I might assure the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail), that is exactly what we have in mind. We have plans drawn up and would be pleased to have any hon. member in the House come over to our Department and we will show you the comprehensive plan we have in mind for these new Homes for the Aged.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am very thankful to the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow), as I am sure are all the hon. members, for his explanation of the purposes of the bill. I want to say that I consider this bill a definite step forward. Furthermore, I do think there is room for extending this bill, rather to take into consideration things outside of the government institutions, municipal or county. In principle I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) is right. What we need are government institutions, government sponsored and government financed. However, I think we should recognize the fact that there are and will continue to be, a fairly large number of what we now call private institutions for the aged which are not really private. These places are run by Church bodies, they are run by other groups, fraternal organizations, and also groups of new Canadians who want to provide an atmosphere for aged citizens in which they will feel at home. In so far as they are concerned, this scheme is, in my opinion, unjust.

I have a letter from the Commissioner of Public Welfare of Toronto in which he lists all the homes for the aged which exist in this city. I had the opportunity of visiting quite a number of them some years back, when I was on the Welfare Committee of the City Council. Some of them should have been closed

many years ago. Others are still serving a useful purpose. I may say that the majority of the Homes in Toronto are operated by various religious groups. The bill does not provide for any capital grants to institutions of that sort, so that they could undertake the construction of new homes, as they are required. Nor does it provide for sharing in the cost of maintenance.

I say, that while I may agree with the principle and the approach of the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) I do not think that principle should be applied rigidly at this stage of development. In the list before me, I find the Salvation Army operates a number of these institutions. They will undoubtedly continue to operate them. The Catholic Church operates a number of them. I visited some of them years ago, and I am prepared to say that there are aged people of that religious faith who feel more at home in an institution of that sort than they would in a city or county institution. Then there are the Protestant homes in Toronto. All of these institutions are attempting to make a contribution to the betterment of conditions of the aged citizens, but will in no way be entitled to aid.

I suggest the government should at this time broaden the principle of the bill so as to provide for both capital grants and maintenance payments to bona fide institutions of this sort, which have been in existence until now, and which merit and receive the recognition of the department as serving the purpose for which they are created. I believe most of them will be able to satisfy the departmental requirements, and I think they should be entitled to the same consideration, under this bill, as is now provided to give assistance to any country or municipal institution.

I welcome the bill. I think it is a step forward. I think the hon. Minister's, (Mr. Goodfellow) approach is quite a progressive one, and I find no fault with it, but I do think the point I have raised requires and merits the favourable consideration of the government.

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT (CCF Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words regarding northern Ontario. As you know, our problems in the north are altogether different from those here in Old Ontario. We have to start from scratch. We have no homes for the aged in the north and the burden of constructing these homes will fall much more heavily upon our municipalities than they will in the older-established counties in Old Ontario. Our problem is much more difficult in that a great portion of the north consists of unorganized townships. For instance, in my own constituency, we have three organized towns, seven organized townships, and three or four improved districts. All the rest of the constituency consists of unorganized townships, and the job of looking after these people is a much greater one than it is in Old Ontario. I have seen many times, the Provincial Police, going out long distances into the bush to bring out the bodies of aged people who have died alone in lumber camps, that is, they have taken their allowances, and their old-age pensions, and gone back into the bush to live alone, where they thought they might not have to pay rent, or be put to any other unusual expense, and they have died alone in the bush.

I, for one, commend the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) for many of the sections in this bill. One in particular is that which gives the magistrate the power to commit an aged person to a home. That is a good section. Many of these people will not leave their homes in the bush; they feel they are independent, and the Provincial Police have to go in quite often to see they are still getting along, and that puts a great burden on the Provincial Police, who have to travel over large areas unnecessarily, simply because they know a lot of these people are just existing in shacks and in these lumber camps. I know of many of these cases, and I hope when the building programme starts in the north, the hon. Minister

(Mr. Goodfellow) will take a keen interest in our problems up there.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) was in the north on the 10th of January, I believe, and was present at a very well-attended meeting of the municipal organizations of three constituencies, and while there he learned their problems, and I hope he will give the north the assistance it needs.

MR. WELLAND S. GEMMELL (PC Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise for a few moments to join with the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail), and the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) in commending the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) in bringing in this legislation, particularly for giving some extra help to the problem which has arisen in northern Ontario. I happen to have been connected with an attempt to construct a house of refuge in the Sudbury district, and I imagine the same problems arose in all of the districts of Northern Ontario, where we have such large Crown lands with which to deal. Unlike southern Ontario, we have not the county organizations to deal with. For eight years I have been connected with that work, trying to get one started in Sudbury. The main problem in getting it started is, of course, the financing. We estimate it will cost $500,000 to build a suitable institution for this purpose, and I am sure in the next two years our municipality will have this work completed, so that our aged people will be taken care of. This legislation will be very acceptable to the people of northern Ontario, and I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) to know we certainly appreciate this legislation, and I feel the same way as the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) concerning the old people. I believe they should be taken care of in the best possible way during the last days of their life, so that their last days may be happy ones.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I only want to add this thought to the discussion which has already taken place, that it would be well, as a government, to give some assistance by way of assuring the operating and maintenance costs of some of these homes which would be opened up for taking in the older people. I have in mind, as I speak, one such place in the village of Priceville, about which I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) may know something. I think that place is being carried on, on a very high standard, and is taking from the House of Refuge, which is already overcrowded, people who cannot find accommodations elsewhere.

I have in my mind, further, a registered nurse who came to my home over the week-end and suggested she was getting tired of the practise of the nursing profession in the hospitals, feeling she could not keep on with it very much longer, and her idea was to buy a substantial house in one of the villages in my riding, and take in these old persons, and care for them.

To my way of thinking, Mr. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) we cannot go very far wrong in perusing that story, because this nurse unquestionably would give good leadership to a place of that character, and your Department could very well set up regulations which would keep that place and other like places on a high standard. There would not be any great danger that the aged people would suffer as a result of being in these particular homes. I think we could well agree we should not give this privilege and this help to districts which has not now a House of Refuge. I can well understand, if you started, for instance, in my riding and gave a grant to a person who would run a private place, the House of Refuge would never be built. My idea is this should supplement the work of the House of Refuge, to enable all the people to be cared for in the best way possible

I would urge upon the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow), even at this stage, to consider very seriously the possibility of extending to these approved places, a grant for at least part of the cost of operating and carrying on their work.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks made by

the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), I think I mentioned, when I was speaking in introducing this bill for second reading, that we should encourage private welfare institutions. There are some very good private institutions, but there are also some pretty poor private institutions at the present time. The same thing holds true in respect to private nursing homes. We have cases where an individual—a nurse, or what have you, has established a home to take in these old-age pensioners, when these people require special care—as in many cases they do—and we have made the $10 bonus applicable to them, and they have been getting $40 a month.

In the case of the private institutions, we did make the payment of 10c per day, which was payable under the Charitable Institutions Act, and was available to them, at the same time as we brought in our $10 bonus. We have an item in our estimates this year for $113,000, which will go to these private institutions, to make up the $3 a month, over and above what they get from the old-age pensions in those private institutions.

But I feel in the building of any programme for the accommodation of the elderly people, we must make sure the municipalities have proper accommodations. I think we have to be very careful in sponsoring the building of two or three homes or private institutions. There are many fine private institutions, in this province, but there are certain individuals concerning whom—knowing the type of homes they run at the present time—I would hesitate to attempt to set up regulations to govern the type of care they are giving to the elderly people. With the shortage of accommodations at the present time, our department cannot countenance those conditions which exist, therefore, I would hesitate to set up regulations. I think our first objective must be to support the municipalities and encourage them to go ahead with the public institutions.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 65th Order.

THE CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 65th Order; second reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend the Children's Protection Act," Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend The Children's Protection Act."

MR. WILLIAM J. GRUMMETT (CCF Cochrane South): Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) going to give us a little more explanation?

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Why does he not give it, without being asked?

MR. GOODFELLOW: The purpose of this bill is to give the municipalities relief, and to relieve the real estate taxpayers of a certain amount of the present cost of children's welfare.

As the hon. members of this House are aware, at the present time the municipality is responsible for the legal liability for these children who are admitted to the care of the Children's Aid Societies. The amount is estimated at nearly $3,000,000, and that falls upon the taxpayers of the municipalities. We anticipate that by assuming 25 per cent. of those legal liabilities, and assume it will cost the provincial treasury approximately $100,000.

The other main provision in this bill is new, inasmuch as there is a great deal to be said for the work which has been done by the child-welfare organizations, and the Children's Aid Societies of this province in the past. In most places they can be very highly complimented for the way they are trying to retain their private autonomy by collecting private funds, through campaigns of one type or another. We felt that should be encouraged, and that is what

we have in mind, to give encouragement to the Children's Aid Society to go out and collect funds from the most desirable source, that is, from the people in the community itself, first, having in mind the collection of money, and, secondly, to get the people in the community interested in child welfare work. I think we should in every possible way encourage that private autonomy, and we feel that by offering the societies, what you might call a "pension"—or a prize—for good work, by giving them 25 cents for every dollar they collect by private contributions themselves, it will put new life into a great many Children's Aid Societies in the Province of Ontario.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) is quite well aware that the contributions by the counties to the support of children's aid have been made in different ways. For instance, I am reminded at the moment of a county which does not make a personal canvass at all, but which puts a mill in the tax rate, and paid that toward the support of the Children's Aid Society. I think I am right in saying when that mill is collected from the taxpayers of a certain county, the government does not make a grant—oh, I am wrong about that, so I will not pursue it. Let me proceed from this point; these counties which collect the monies for Children's Aid Societies by a mill assessment; what position will they be in under this bill? It would seem to me to proceed in the manner in which we have for this last few years, by collection of the taxes, will not earn them the reward which my hon. friend (Mr. Goodfellow) has promised, in a financial sense, in this bill.

Let us consider some of these large rural areas, such as the County of Grey and the County of Bruce, and some of the other similar areas; the counties have found it better to collect by a tax rate. They have over the years not been very successful in their personal canvasses. There is a lot of very old people living in these areas, and very few people who are able to give generously to a cause, no matter how laudable that cause may be. These counties, if they are penalized for proceeding the way they have the last year or two, the only course open to them is not to collect it on the mill rate, but to go back to special canvasses, and I think these areas would be at a disadvantage when it comes to special canvasses, and I wonder what the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) would recommend as to that.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the case in some counties, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). There are a few Children's Aid Societies in the province who more or less go to the county council once a year and get more or less a blank cheque for all their legal liability, as well as the cost of protection work and the full operation of the Children's Aid Society.

There is a principle, it seems to me, behind that, and it is this, that if they were to expand across the whole province and every Children's Aid Society were to get in the habit, and they found the municipality or the county, whichever the case may be, agreeable to it, that you would have Children's Aid Societies, which is a private organization, spending $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 of public money which they would get from the municipality or from the county. In principle, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is sound, if the Children's Aid Societies are going to continue as a private organization, I think they should, because they can do a greater job than any government organization. This is the way we have taken to encourage all Children's Aid Societies to get back to the old subscription basis where the people not only make their own contribution, but in so doing they also take greater interest in the welfare of the unfortunate children in the community.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF West York): Mr. Speaker, there is one phase of this that does not seem to be yet before us, and I would like to bring it to the attention of the hon. Minister

(Mr. Goodfellow) and ask him if something cannot be done along the following lines.

I do not have the exact facts, but I think it is without question before hon. members of this House, that some of our difficulty, and some of the extra burden being placed on Children's Aid Societies throughout the province is due to commitments made as a result of broken homes, due to the liquor business in this province. In view of the fact the province is a beneficiary from the liquor business in the form of various revenues, I am wondering if some consideration cannot be given in those cases where children are committed as a result of broken homes through the liquor business, to having the province take care of the entire cost so far as the Children's Aid Society is concerned. It seems to me if we are going to take the revenue on the one side, we ought to take the responsibility and look after the wreckage on the other side.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) it would be most difficult and impractical to separate those families committed because of intemperance in the home, from all the other types of broken homes in the province, where the children have to be committed to the Children's Aid Society. I am afraid in our department it would be too difficult to separate those particular families.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): May I say, Mr. Speaker, that 25 cents on the dollar is too much like the booby prize, speaking in the language of prizes. I was hoping it would be dollar for dollar. In collecting from the public, you do not always get the people who can best afford to give the money. The people who have the most sensitive social consciences are the people who give to all these things. I am not at all sure that 25 per cent., 25 cents on the dollar, is much of a prize, if you are going to get the rest from the public unevenly. You always get your contributions from the same types of persons. With the mill rate, you get everybody in the county, for if a mill is levied on the property, everybody has to pay. I often see all these things meet a response from a certain type of person and no response at all from another type.

I must say I am not very happy about 25 cents on the dollar. I do not think it is much of a prize.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, in answering the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) I think it is a very nice gesture.

MISS MACPHAIL: Just a gesture.

MR. GOODFELLOW: It will amount to about $200,000 as far as this bonus to the Children's Aid Society is concerned. I always like to creep before I walk on any new principle, to see how it will work out for a while. It may be that it will encourage the Children's Aid Society in soliciting their private subscriptions to a point where the government at a later date might find it could go further with it.

I might say to hon. members of the House I have had very splendid reports on the reception it is receiving from Children's Aid Societies throughout the province. They are very much pleased with it. As a matter of fact, the old principle, upon which grants were made to societies, in my opinion, was not sound, and is still unsound inasmuch as they get graduated grants from $500 to $2,000 according to the grading which was set up by people in our department, that is, in relationship to expenditures or receipts.

Therefore, in the case of a Children's Aid Society out in Dufferin County, their total expenditures might be $6,000 a year, and they might get a $1,500 grant from the province; on the other hand, in the City of Toronto where they might have perhaps $500,000 expenditure, the Children's Aid Society might only get a $500 grant. I do not think that was based on a sound principle. I feel now we are getting on the right track and I hope we will be able, through trial and error, to find where we are going on this new grant of 25 per cent.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 71st Order.

CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 71st Order, second reading of Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1946," Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. ARTHUR WELSH (PC Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act."

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Is the bill printed or not?

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, hon. members are having difficulty finding it, and I gather it was just distributed today. I may be wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not in the books, and I think it was distributed only today. I was looking forward to examining this bill myself and have not had an opportunity to do so, because I rely on my book.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Would my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) consent to allowing that to go over to committee? I do not think there is anything of a radical nature in it. I think they are more or less routine amendments.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington): Mr. Speaker, there is one thing: I might not have got the substance of this bill entirely, but it has to do with where we have set up—and I think probably there was only one of them, if I am right—a conservation authority, The Grand River Conservation Authority, which was set up before the River Authorities in general were set up. That is, the Grand River Conservation Commission was set up first, and they had power under the first act over all that watershed.

Since that we have set up Conservation Authorities, which is a new body on the same watershed. Who has the authority, or who is going to be the dominating authority? Is it settled, Mr. Minister?

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, practically all the members of the original commission, are members of the Authority, and the commission is gradually dropping out of the picture. The Authorities are replacing them. In the Province of Ontario the members of the original commission are now on the Authority.

MR. McEWING: I grant you that, Mr. Speaker, but here is the conflicting point: the members of the original commission have started a scheme and are going ahead with it notwithstanding the new Authorities set up, and they say: "We are going to complete this scheme before we give up." Now, it is quite true the members of that commission are all on the River Authority which was set up later, but they still have the dominating authority on that scheme. I think that has been accepted so far. I may be wrong.

MR. WELSH: Well, I think both the Federal Government and ourselves would be very glad if the original commission was dissolved.

MR. McEWING: Oh yes.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh), what happens in a case like that of Etobicoke Authority and the Humber Bay Authority? Now, Etobicoke Township lies exactly between. Does this mean we are going to have an amalgamation of those two Authorities, or which is going to take which over in this particular case? Or is that the intention of the bill, because it seems to me we have two Authorities now, dealing with common problems for

a very close area, and it might be well to have an amalgamation of the two Authorities in this case.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the purpose of the bill, because we have knowledge of two or three cases where we have municipalities which either have small Authorities of their own, and want to amalgamate with a larger one or where they should be taken into the larger Authority. Under the former act, that was not possible, and that is the very reason this amendment is brought in, to permit that sort of thing. I think we have three cases now pending.

MR: MILLARD: Is that the intention in this case?

MR. WELSH: Yes, definitely.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) if this bill is wide enough, for instance, to allow the Humber Valley and the Don Valley Authorities to be amalgamated, if two-thirds of either one of them so desire?

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, I might say I think if the municipalities and the Authorities concerned are willing, the Act is broad enough to permit that.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) a question. Is it the intention of your Department to participate in the International Conference on Conservation and the Development of Natural Resources, which is being sponsored by the United Nations at Lake Success in the month of August of this year? Or, have you heard about it?

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) for bringing this to my attention. This is the first I have heard of it.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, I heard it mentioned on the radio the other night. It is being sponsored by the United Nations Organization and is to be attended by delegates from all over. It seems to me it would be very fitting if the Department of Planning and Development was represented at that important gathering, by the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) perhaps.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 50.

THE HOSPITALS AID ACT, 1948

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 50th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 90, "An Act to amend the Hospitals Aid Act, 1948." Mr. Kelley.

HON. RUSSELL T. KELLEY (PC Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, in addition to the bill as it stands, we desire to make an amendment reading as follows:

> "Clause (a) of subsection 2 of section 2 of The Hospitals Aid Act, 1948, is repealed, and the following substituted therefor:
>
> "(a) all moneys appropriated by the Legislature for:
>
> "(i) aid to hospitals; and
>
> "(ii) grants by way of provincial aid to sanatoria."

it does not change the procedure in any way. In our regular estimates, we will have our regular grants for the sanatoria and the hospitals, and in turn they will be turned over to the Hospital Aid Fund.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 90 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 49th Order.

NIAGARA PARKS ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 49th Order; House in Committee on Section 14 of Bill No. 89, "The Niagara Parks Act, 1949," Mr. Daley.

HON. C. DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, in regard to Section 14 of the Niagara Parks Act Bill, the question was raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) as to whether or not the wording was all that could be desired. In Section 4 it sets out all the duties required of the Commission. I will not take the time now to read them all, but they are all definitely laid out.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): In Section 3?

MR. DALEY: Yes, Section 3. To comply with the suggestion as made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe)—and I believe this matter has been discussed with him — we have changed Section 14, to simply read:

> "All moneys received by the Commission shall be applied in the discharge of its debts and obligations."

I think that covers the question raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think it does meet the suggestion I made, and it is perfectly satisfactory to me. However, I do see some slight ambiguity or conflict as between Subsections 1 and 2. I do not anticipate any difficulty about it, but your amended Subsection 1 now states:

> "All moneys received by the Commission shall be applied in its discharge of its debts and obligations."

That covers the point I made the other day and I am quite satisfied. However, Subsection 2, then goes on to say that any surplus moneys are supposed to be paid into the Consolidated Fund on the order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) is not in his place at the moment, but he was making the point the other day, as I understood him, that he did not think the Lieutenant-Governor in Council should have the power to reach out for these surplus moneys. I do not feel very strongly about it myself, but there is some conflict there.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, our chief obligation is to pay that debt, and I can assure you that there will be no money for the Consolidated Revenue Fund until that is done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You may get a lot more.

Section 14 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 51st Order.

SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT, 1947

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 51st Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 91, "An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act, 1947." Mr. Kelley.

HON. RUSSELL T. KELLEY (PC Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, it has been requested that a third amendment be made to the bill. Clause "K" of section 1 of the bill is amended by adding at the end thereof the words, "or out of the fund established under The Hospitals Aid Act, 1948," so that the clause now reads as follows:

> "Provincial aid shall mean aid granted to a Sanatorium out of moneys appropriated by the Legislature or out of the fund established under the Hospitals Aid Act, 1948."

It is the same explanation as before. There will be funds in the estimates out of both of these funds and they will be transferred to the Sanatorium Fund and paid out that way.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 91 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 54th Order.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT, 1939

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 54th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 112, "An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act, 1939," Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would explain this section for the benefit of laymen like myself.

MR. FROST: Which section is that?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Section 3. Explain it in lay language.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to do that. In regard to Section 3, Subsection 1, the situation was, for instance, in connection with a life annuity or life interest; supposing a widow was left the interest on $100,000? That amount was capitalized on the basis of her life expectancy and she was given four years to pay the duty. We felt that was a hardship, so we lengthened the period to ten years.

The other section, Subsection 2 of Section 3, is the same principle only with the expectancy extended to life.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Chairman, would the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) tell us this? Does this government make this change in Section 2 solely because they wish to assist the widows concerned, or do they feel they have to make this change because the price setup in this country has been disrupted following the war and today a dollar is only worth 50 cents or 60 cents? Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) explain that?

MR. FROST: It is a combination of both of those things. It is designed to help the person leaving an estate to preferred beneficiaries with $50,000 or less. The fact is, the $25,000 which has been in the Act for many years, now is not any more than, translated back to 1920, $50,000 today. That is the purpose of the section.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to ask, are there any other Acts in the Statute books where that applies? There may be other Statutes on the books.

MR. FROST: I would say old-age pensions. The fact of the matter is that when this government came into power the old-age pension was $20, now there are many cases of $40.

MR. DENNISON: You should double it as you have here.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

On Section 5.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I may be missing something here. The Act goes into force on the 1st of April?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This Act will then apply only in respect of estates created by deaths occurring after the 1st of April?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (CCF Cochrane South): In other words, if they are going to die they should wait for a month.

Section 5 agreed to.

Bill No. 112 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 56th Order.

INCOME TAX ACT (ONTARIO)

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 56th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 114, "An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Ontario)," Mr. Frost.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is adamant in his determination to proceed with this policy of throwing away $17,000,000 a year.

MR. FROST: No, Mr. Chairman, I am adamant in proceeding in our policy over here in attempting to lighten the load of income tax for the men and women in the small brackets. We are hoping the forthcoming Federal Budget will, after some three years of urging, give great relief to the small man. Our contribution to it is that we stay out of this picture. We do not want to come in until the Dominion takes the course we confidently hope it will take, considering the proposal we made some two years ago which I think they will accept. We can reconsider after that.

MR MACLEOD: Just one question. Inasmuch as the Province of Ontario and its taxpayers have contributed so richly to the great reserves of Mr. Abbott, may I suggest that when the budget comes down, the hon. Provincial Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. Frost) urge that the tax be made retroactive to cover the past three years.

MR. FROST: We have asked that for three years and hope it will come about. I will say this to the hon. members of the House that my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) mentioned the large amount held by Mr. Abbott and the Dominion Government. That all bears out what we have said, we have placed nothing in the way of the Ottawa people implementing their budget for social services.

MR. MACLEOD: But you lost $45,000,000.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) assuming income tax reductions if, as and when made by the Parliament of Canada, will mean very much assistance to the small-income tax payer. The last time Mr. Abbott reduced the federal income tax the relative benefit to the man in the $10,000 a year class was greater than to the small-income taxpayers.

MR. FROST: All you can do is hope and pray.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Apparently all you have been doing for three years is hoping and praying, and the policy you have followed has not made any difference.

MR. FROST: When we get into power we will make these changes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Your estate will be paying Succession Duties by then.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 114 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 53rd Order.

LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 53rd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 103, "The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949," Mr. Blackwell.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale). Mr. Chairman, The Loan and Trust Corporations Act has not had second reading. It was held up the other afternoon at the request of the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder).

MR. BLACKWELL: It has had second reading.

MR. WISMER: No, it was held up.

MR. BLACKWELL: It is in committee now.

MR. C. C. CALDER (L London): I believe the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) is correct.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am sorry, the bill was in committee and the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) sent me a note and asked me not to proceed with it, and I did not call it. Nevertheless, it had had second reading.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On what day did it have second reading?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: March 2nd.

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the government to proceed with these sections, and read through these 150 sections when it is now 6.00 o'clock?

MR. FROST: You still have two minutes. Actually, most of this is only a re-statement.

Sections 10 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): This seems to be a bit of a farce. Can we not say we have no objection to it?

Sections 18 to 23 inclusive agreed to.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would not suggest this in any ordinary bill, but I held this in committee for over a week in order to enable anyone to examine it. I think, Mr. Chairman, if it is the will of the House that you should call the sections quickly, if any hon. member wants to speak on any one section he may do so.

MR. C. C. CALDER (L London): Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with these remarks and would also like to thank the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) for holding the bill over for me. I do not object to any section.

Section 24 agreed to.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) wants to raise some particular question. I think hon. members should be agreeable not to go over all sections.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Is that proper procedure?

On Section 25:

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, there seems to me there is an inconsistency.

MR. BLACKWELL: What section?

MR. WISMER: Section 25. My suggestion is that the word "general" should appear between "a" and "meeting" in the first line. It should be—"a general meeting." That is on page 11, section 25.

MR. BLACKWELL: I do not think I am looking at what you read.

MR. WISMER: Section 25 now reads, " a meeting of the shareholders." It seems to me what you want to say is "A general meeting." The word "general" should be in there.

MR. BLACKWELL: Any meeting of the shareholders is a general meeting. It is a question of whether it is an ordinary general meeting or a special general meeting.

MR. WISMER: On Section 29 you specify "a general meeting." It seems to me, to keep it consistent, the word "general" ought to be in Section 25.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I think, perhaps, the point is we should be consistent about it, although I know the legislative and corporation lawyers have not always been consistent about it. In preceding and succeeding sections you find the term "meeting," and sometimes "general meeting." I do not think there is any difference but it might be well to be consistent. There is, of course, a difference between an annual meeting and a special meeting.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I think if it reads, "general meeting" in those places, that would be all right. I am sorry, if it reads, "meeting" in both places, I have asked the legislative counsel if there was any reason for that, and he says not.

MR. JOLLIFFE: While we are on the point, I was wondering if the word "general" was necessary at all. A meeting of shareholders is just a meeting.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is what I am suggesting, take the "general" out and leave it "meeting."

MR. WISMER: In that regard, Mr. Chairman, just as a layman, we are going to come to the point of view that a "meeting" is a meeting, and meetings of shareholders are all the same. There

has been some trouble gone to in this Act to distinguish between the type of meetings you call. Some meetings have been called "special," some "general," and some just "meetings."

MR. BLACKWELL: There is a technical distinction which I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) appreciates.

MR. WISMER: If there is any distinction, I am not sure that any word "general" should appear or the word "special" should appear.

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh, no. If I may explain that, a "general meeting" is one which occurs under the ordinary structure of the Act, and a "special meeting" is one called for a particular purpose.

MR. WISMER: When you want one thing done.

MR. BLACKWELL: Now, "special" has to stay where it is. It has significance. Any other section?

MR. SALSBERG: Is it not a fact that the Chairman is obliged to sign every section of the bill as they go through?

MR. BLACKWELL: If no hon. member objects, the Chairman can then assent to each section. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the Leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver) will agree with that. Of course, that cannot be done if some hon. member objects to it.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be understood that where we depart from standard practices, it should be with the unanimous consent of the House. I do not know why you stop with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the Liberal group.

MR. BLACKWELL: I said that if it was unanimous.

MR. JOLLIFFE: As far as I know there is no objection. The Chairman, of course, has to certify that every section was carried or otherwise disposed of. I would suggest that if there is any section that any hon. member wishes to speak to, he should indicate it now, and, if not, it could go through.

Sections 26 to 156 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 103 reported.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, let us call it 6 o'clock.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise and report certain bills with and without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain bills with amendments and certain bills without amendments, and I move the report be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.10 o'clock.

Vol. III, No. 24

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 15, 1949

Report of Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, Mr. Cathcart 853

The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1948, bill to amend, Mr. Scott, first reading 853

Resumption of Debate on the Budget, Mr. Nixon 854

Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Park, agreed to 923

Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to 923

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1949.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Amongst the many guests we are privileged to have in the House during the session, today we have, I believe, a very particular delegation in which we are all very much interested. We have Miss Irwin and seven students of the sight-saving class at Brock Avenue School who are making a special study of civics this year. We were fortunate to have been able to locate seats in the Speaker's gallery for this very distinguished group of our future citizens, and I know every hon. member is delighted to have the members of the sight-saving class as our guests on this occasion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (PC Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on miscellaneous private bills, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Your Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its fourth report:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. 24—An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 5—An Act to incorporate The Institute of Accredited Public Accountants of Ontario.

Bill No. 11—An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill No. 17—An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke.

Bill No. 22—An Act respecting Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association.

Bill No. 31—An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 22, An Act respecting Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT, 1948

HON. H. R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests, Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Kelley, that leave be granted to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1948," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) tell us something about this bill.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, under the Forest Fires Prevention Act, at the present time, a permit is required before undertaking the clearing of roads, for telephone lines, and so on. We are extending this section to include areas being flooded for the raising of water for power purposes.

We also have, under this Act, the authority to summon men to assist the departmental men in fire fighting. We are also extending it to include the use of equipment, so if a man has, say, a bulldozer and happens to be unwilling to lend it for the purpose of fighting fires, we have the power to take it and use it. The bill provides for compensation for the use of such equipment, and in the event of loss, the owner would be reimbursed for it.

Thirdly, under the Act, there is a provision that any licensee or owner of land should fight a fire which might start on his land immediately, but there is no requirement that he notify us, and there have been cases where fires have got out of control through the licensee, or owner, not notifying the department immediately, so that we could get men onto the scene. This will extend the authority whereby a man not only must try to put out the fire when it starts, but must notify the department, so that the departmental forces may get on the scene as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 24th Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 24th Order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost.

MR. HARRY A. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Speaker, this is the first occasion upon which I have had the opportunity to address you in formal debate, and I do not propose to deny myself the pleasure of extending to you, sir, my very sincere regards and appreciation of the able manner in which you discharge the important in the office to which you have been elected.

I have probably seen more Speakers in action in this Legislature than any other hon. member. I know that comparisons are never in good taste, so I will not say that you are the best Speaker the House has had in the last 30 years, but I will say I have known of none better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: After listening to that rich, kindly Welsh voice intoning the prayers for five days per week in such an impressive manner, I find I can sleep in on Sunday mornings without any qualms of conscience at not going to church.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one cannot miss the feeling of loss which we have here today when we view the desk of our late colleague, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds), whom we all knew so intimately, and regarded so very warmly indeed, and to have to stop and consider that his funeral is under way at the moment in which I am speaking.

I had, of course, known Mr. Reynolds very intimately from the time he first entered the Legislature, and I regarded him as a warm, personal friend. Just last Friday evening I sat near him when he was at dinner, with a number of guests at his table, and his dry wit had the table in roars of laughter during the entire meal. Little did we think then that in the space of a short 24 hours, he would be called to his reward. I think there is a feeling deep down in the hearts of all of us, sir, that we would like, when the call comes to us, if it might come under similar circumstances, to answer it in the same manner. He died in the fullness of his years and good works; he was indeed a splendid citizen,

of the type which made this great nation of Canada what it is today.

I am extremely sorry that my good friend, the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) is absent today through illness. For 27 years we have sat opposite to each other in this Legislature, having come in together in 1919, although he was absent for one 3-year term, through no fault of his own. It is indeed a pleasure, and somewhat of a change, to look across there, and get a welcoming, friendly smile from the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) who occupies the number one desk on the Treasury benches today.

I am a little to sorry to note from press reports and intimations which have been made in the House from time to time, that the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) does not propose to hold this important position, but will soon relinquish it to someone who will succeed him. Like several others who have mentioned this matter, I might say that if he proposes to change his mind in this matter, I can assure him he will have my strong moral support. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as nearly all the good Conservatives in Brant vote for me anyway, I am sure I could get the necessary credentials and come down to the convention, and support him there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: I do not intend to discuss the terms of a bill which was introduced by my hon. Leader (Mr. Oliver) yesterday. I hope it will in due course come up for discussion in the House.

There are in that bill references to estimates in every department which will come before us, and I do not think I would be out of order in saying this; the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) asked me when we were discussing the first estimate in his Department of Agriculture, if I had signed a letter with relation to Cabinet Ministers not taking the $10,000, and I had not clearly understood to what he was referring at the time. I thought it might be some letter which the Cabinet Ministers signed, saying they would not accept over $8,000. But on reading *Hansard,* I find the reference was to a letter signed by the hon. Premiers since 1934 instructing the Treasury Department not to pay the Cabinet Ministers over $8,000, and while I believe I did sign such a letter, it did not particularly impress itself upon my mind. It was well over six years ago, and I have signed a good many thousands of letters and documents, as my friend the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) well knows, which go through the department, as well as the department of the hon. Premiers.

I do suggest to the government today, in the absence of the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) that this is a matter which might very well be left in abeyance for a time. After all it is one which is embarrassing and unpleasant to discuss before this House, and it might be well to leave this matter for whoever is going to be number one Minister in the government, after our good friend, the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) retires from that position, in the not too distant future.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have always strongly felt with regard to increases of salaries for Cabinet Ministers and hon. members of the Legislature, that any move in that direction should be taken during the last session of the Legislature, to be made effective after dissolution, and a new Legislature is elected. Then the electors will know that the indemnity of an hon. member is to be $3,000, and that of a Cabinet Minister is to be $10,000, plus the $3,000, and if they know they are to have a Cabinet Minister receiving $13,000 a year, they will naturally look for one of a calibre which is worth $13,000 to the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: I am not suggesting that any hon. member in the Cabinet today is not worth that and much more, of course. But I think there is a right way and a wrong way to go about this matter, and I do suggest, in all sincerity, to the Cabinet that under the circumstances, the matter might stand

in abeyance for a year, and I am sure I could prevail upon my hon. Leader (Mr. Oliver) under those circumstances, to withdraw the bill he has before the House.

Now, with regard to the estimates—and this matter in particular; there is no question but what the statutory provision is $10,000 a year, but it does seem to me that over the signature of five different Premiers, Mr. Hepburn, Mr. Conant, your humble servant, Mr. Drew and Mr. Kennedy, that this statutory figure of $10,000 should be reduced to $8,000, and that year after year in the estimates it has appeared as $8,000, that the matter should be held pending further consideration. Surely if that can be done by a letter from a Premier, the hon. members of this Legislature ought to have some control over these statutory items as they appear in the estimates.

We are now at the stage where practically 50 per cent. of our estimates appear in statutory form. In some departments, as a matter of fact, it is much more than that. Consider the Department of Highways, for instance; we only have some $3,000,000 to be voted, and $35,500,000 statutory, over which evidently the hon. members have no control in dealing with the estimates.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE: (CCF Leader of the Opposition): It will be more than that next year.

MR. NIXON: Yes, next year it will be more than that. Here, for instance, under "main office" we find, for instance, "travelling expenses, $100,000." I am at a loss to know why that should be statutory. Then "maintenance, $50,000; publicity, $75,000." Mr. Speaker, if there is any matter this House ought to criticize and be in a position to reduce if they think wise, it is surely that figure of "publicity, $75,000."

In due time, during the progress of the estimates through the House, I propose to bring before you, Mr. Speaker, by way of a definite motion, to test out this matter, as well as to carry out the intention of this particular group, to reduce the estimate of $10,000 which appears in every item of the different departments, in the estimates.

In other sessions, since 1943, I have objected as strenuously as I could to the late openings of this House, generally in March. It was always a great inconvenience and loss to the farmer members to be kept here late in April, because the session was only opened, say, after the 10th of March, or about that time, in previous years. I would be less than fair, indeed, if I did not express my appreciation to the government on this occasion, for having called the House together early in February. I think it is very much preferable; certainly it is to the farmer members, and I cannot see that it is of any advantage to any hon. member to be sitting here late on in the spring, unless it may be that the government feels that when hon. members become restless and uneasy and anxious to get home, they are inclined to let matters slide through more easily, in order to shorten the session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: I do not think it is in the public interest, and I feel we should have ample time to discuss the very important matters which annually come before this House, and the vast sums of money we have to vote. I do not think there should be any drive to finish up on a certain day, but every hon. member should have all the time he wishes to discuss these matters. However, I express my appreciation to the government for calling the session this year early in February, and I suggest that whoever may be number one man next year, that I hope he will be guided by the good example set this year. You can even call it ten days or two weeks earlier, and it will be "okay by me."

Almost every hon. member in this first session after an election speaks about his riding, and I find it very interesting indeed, particularly, to hear from the new hon. members, and let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I have listened with very great interest and close attention to all the addresses given this session,

and I want to particularly congratulate the new hon. members on the high order of the debates they have contributed in the House.

I think I will content myself this afternoon with speaking about my good old riding of Brant. It has just about everything the other hon. members claim for their ridings, and more. I could not possibly enumerate in the short space of time I propose to hold the floor this afternoon, the many outstanding advantages of that riding. I certainly could not confine it in the short space of time my hon. friend for Lambton West (Mr. Cathcart) took in telling us of the merits of his riding. We have fine stretches of rolling, agricultural land, fertile farms, and prosperous farmers, good and blooded livestock, the valuable tobacco lands and fruit orchards, the fine industries distributed in our small towns and villages.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, let me give you a couple of "firsts." The hon. Premier, you know, stressed how many first were represented in this Legislature. Let me tell you of a couple of firsts in Brant County which no one can take away from me at the moment.

Last year, for instance, a very fine Conservative farmer near Cainsville, who always votes for your humble servant, raced and won the King's Plate, with a horse he had himself bred and raised, as he had the dam of this horse before him. It was a very great honour indeed for a breeder such as "Jim" Fair to be able to produce a horse, race it and win this trophy, as well as the gold that goes with it.

This ties in with the budget very closely, Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) because I believe there was probably more money bet on "Jim" Fair's horses in the Province of Ontario than any other stable in this province, and I know he himself won more prizes than any other breeder throughout the whole of Canada who bred the horse which he was racing. That is one "first."

Another first I thought I might mention this afternoon is that it is the only riding that for 30 years continuously has sent the same member back to this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: Now, I do not know whether I am entitled to bring that to your attention or not, but I will say when any other hon. member can stand up and say the same in this House, I will be glad to concede him that privilege. I would not want you to think for a moment that the riding of Brant is easily satisfied, Mr. Speaker, because as a matter of fact, every part of this riding is rather peculiar in its make-up. In 1930 I think it was the then government of Mr. Henry undertook a redistribution and rather "gerrymandered" the province in some sections, but having lost all hope of defeating the sitting member, they thought it would be more or less a good idea to hive the "Grits" in that particular riding, so they gave me a municipality off the Brantford riding, three municipalities off Norfolk riding and one municipality off Oxford riding, but it is rather a strange thing that now I find in the federal field, all of this area, including my own riding, is represented by Progressive-Conservatives in the federal house. However, we will change that very shortly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, I note here an item I might discuss for just a moment, although you may wonder how it ties in with the budget, and that is portraits. This is not an ordinary portrait: I am going to refer to those portraits you see hanging out in the corridors of Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, Speakers and former Premiers of this province. It ties in also with the budget in that they are all put there at the taxpayers' expense, and some of them are rather costly.

I knew many of these honourable gentlemen very intimately, dating from about 1907-08, when I occasionally used to occupy a seat in the galleries in this House when I first went to the Ontario Agricultural College. A very particular

"pal" of mine there was the son of the then Minister of Agriculture, and he used to prevail on me to come down here, and even in that day we used to be able, because of our "pull," to get a seat in our Speaker's Gallery, as our guests are today. I looked down with much interest at Sir James Whitney in operation, and even had the pleasure of meeting him, and from that day to this, I have known, of course, all the Premiers, the Lieutenant-Governors and the Speakers.

As I walk by their portraits hanging in the corridors and look them in the eye, I sometimes think they look back just a bit sheepishly.

Mr. Speaker and hon. members have suggested, including the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that I, sir, should be done in oils and hung out there with the rest of them, and while I hope there are no ulterior motives behind that suggestion, I submit to you that from your position of vantage you should look over this august assembly and tell me how many hon. members you see who have been done in oil and hung. As I recall, there are none here, and while I am not ordinarily superstitious, I do believe that it is just as fatal politically to be done in oil and hung as it would be physically to be boiled in oil and hanged.

I have every intention and desire, if it meets with the wishes of my constituency, to represent that riding for some time yet in this Legislature.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON. —And certainly I am not going to start out with two strikes against me, so that I can assure the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) I think he has some few Premiers, a Lieutenant-Governor or two, and two or three Speakers as a back-log for the portraits, and can proceed with his estimates without any fear that I will throw them out of gear by coming in with a bill for my portrait.

Now, you know I made some investigation in this matter some years ago and was rather amused at some of the things I found. There used to hang right outside this Chamber a very peculiar portrait of a lady, I think it purported to be Laura Secord. It was a tremendously large portrait—I do not know what has become of it—topped by a tiny face and something in the nature of a nightcap. It was suggested that, hiding behind those ample dreses, there was a picture of a former Premier, that he had had his portrait done in oil and did not like it, refused to accept it or pay for it, and the Art Committee of that day were rather at a loss how they were to pay the artist, and it was decided they would simply paint a portrait of Laura Secord over that of the Premier and settle for that.

An artist once told me it was possible to X-ray a picture and find out. I happened to be in a position of authority at that time and I said: "Take that picture away and have it photographed by that X-ray device," and he did so, and, sure enough, hiding behind the folds of Laura Secord's dress was this former Premier of the Province of Ontario.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who was it?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): With a chocolate?

MR. NIXON: That was some time ago. We started to ask questions on the order paper back in the depression days of the 30's, when everybody was considering the value of a dollar, and we found rather an indifferent portrait, just head and shoulders of a Lieutenant-Governor had cost over $5,000. Another portrait of a Premier had cost some $2,800, and he appeared in a pearl grey vest. It was felt that was rather out of keeping, in fact not in good taste, so that pearl grey vest was changed to a black vest, and I do suggest I, who have sat so much longer than any of them, when my portrait is painted, should be entitled to two pairs of pants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: Well, so much for the issue of the portraits. I want now to direct your attention for a very few

moments to the question of hydro, and in particular to the address of my hon. friend, the vice-chairman of the Hydro Commission (Mr. Challies), delivered in this House on the Speech from the Throne.

For a number of years I have been the official financial critic of the opposition; this year we handed that over to hands much more capable and experienced than mine in dealing with the finances of such great magnitude as those the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has placed before us. Certainly I commend to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) the very fine suggestions made by the hon. member (Mr. Brown) the financial critic of this group, and I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was impressed with those suggestions. For that reason I intend to make my remarks this afternoon more of a general nature than I have been in the habit of doing in the past.

I want particularly to deal with the statements which were made in the House by the hon. vice-chairman of the Hydro Commission (Mr. Challies) a few weeks ago.

To some extent, this is threshing over old straw. Mr. Drew used to call it "wet straw," but when we thresh it out on the farm, we call it "old straw" and we do not like to thresh it there any more than we like to thresh it here. However, sometimes it is necessary, and as long as a responsible minister of the government stands up in this House and makes the statements which the hon. vice-chairman of the hydro (Mr. Challies) made, I propose to answer them from my own knowledge of what went on in those days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: Last year, quite a number of the Ministers attempted this very line of attack. I remember particularly the hon. Premier (Mr. Drew) was very vicious in his attack on the government of which I was a member with respect to their sins of omission with regard to hydro developments. I remember also Mr. Gordon Chaplin, the then member for Waterloo South, took the same line. Both these honourable gentlemen were defeated by my friends here (indicating), and I congratulate them on their victories.

My friend, the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) alone remains in the House, and he persists in this attitude of trying to put the responsibility for the power shortage we had last fall, six years and more after they came into office, on the back of the government of which I was a member previous to 1943. Everybody knows who was responsible for the power shortage, and I will just quote four authorities, two Tory and two Grits—that ought to be a fair enough average.

The first one, of course, is my hon. friend, the Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley). Everybody can just look at the hon. Minister and appreciate how absolutely honest he is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: No one would think for a moment of challenging his statement when he spoke in Brantford last fall. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is the old saying that "confession is good for the soul," and on that, sir, you would be a greater authority than I, but this is what the *Expositor* said of the hon. Minister of Health's (Mr. Kelley) statement:

"HYDRO SHORTAGE COMES UP IN TALK BY KELLEY

"While addressing the annual meeting of the Brant County Federation of Agriculture on Friday, Honourable Russell T. Kelley, Ontario Minister of Health, mentioned that proper lighting was essential in the prevention of eye trouble.

" 'Maybe as a member of the Drew government, I shouldn't be saying anything about lighting, in view of the hydro power shortage we are experiencing in this province,' he said, and his listeners chuckled, 'but we don't deserve all the blame.

" 'We all made poor guesses. We didn't realize that business was going

to expand the way it did following the war'."

There, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) in five short lines quoted in the press on his speech told more of the real reasons for the hydro shortage than the hon. Minister in charge of hydro (Mr. Challies) gave this House in an hour and a half's address.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: Then this reference was given by my hon. friend, I think from York West (Mr. Millard) in my absence from the House, but I would just like again to draw it to your attention. It is an address by Mr. Robert Saunders, the chairman of the Hydro Commission, at Oakville on October 29th, at which time he said:

"Lack of Slump Fooled Hydro Says Saunders

" 'We all anticipated a recession of business following the war,' Robert Saunders, chairman of the Ontario Hydro Commission, said last night in a speech in Victoria Hall, arranged by the Oakville Industries Council. Mr. Saunders said for this reason hydro engineers 'did not foresee the tremendous post-war prosperity—and they are not to be criticized'."

There, then, you have two very responsible Conservative authorities. I would now refer to my first Liberal authority, and that is the Rt. Hon. C. D. Howe. He made a speech in London, which was reported in the *Star* of November 13, 1948, and in which he said:

"The hydro shortage in Ontario is 'an example of insecurity and chaos brought about by the neglect of a Conservative Government,' Rt. Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, asserted today.

" 'That shortage was serious last year, is still more serious this year, and threatens to assume calamity proportions in 1949.'

"The Minister said the unemployment and loss of production caused by the power shortage will represent a 'serious setback' to the Federal Government's economic programme. Moreover, the situation could not be excused by reference to last summer's drought. Drought played a 'relatively minor part' in Ontario's present scarcity."

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Pretty badly wrong there, was he not?

MR. NIXON: Well, we will see how you come out next fall. Maybe you will not be able to blame the weather then. Certainly we have been short of power for some time now, and no one knows that better than the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). There is a particular reference I wish to make from Mr. Howe's address in London. The hon. Minister (Mr. Challies), in his speech on this matter, stated and attempted to prove at very great length that the hydro could not secure priorities during the war for these developments, and particularly for the Des Joachims on the Upper Ottawa. Mr. Howe said this:

"And I further undertook to give top priority for the materials involved in the proposed construction."

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be plainer and more emphatic than that, and I stated on the floor of this House that in a personal conference with Mr. Howe in 1943, he had assured me the hydro would have no difficulty whatever in getting priorities for this development on the Upper Ottawa River, that the one thing they were particularly concerned about, and most anxious about, was the shortage of power in this great industrial province to carry out their production programme for the necessities of war.

I submit the question of priorities did not and should not and never should have entered into this controversy in any way, shape or form. During the war, starting in 1941, in the Province of Quebec, a development twice the size

of this in magnitude, carried on by a private company — the Aluminum Company of Canada — received every priority, and they went ahead and developed some 1,200,000 horsepower, where these developments on the Upper Ottawa only total 480,000 horsepower. Certainly if that company could secure priorities, does anyone for a moment think the Hydro Commission of this Province of Ontario could not have secured priorities?

That argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Challies) certainly falls very flat indeed. I do say most emphatically, on my responsibility as a member of this Legislature at that time and today, that in personal conference with Mr. Howe at that time, he assured me there would be no question whatever about our ability to secure priorities and the necessary materials to go ahead with this development.

As a matter of fact, I had an opportunity when addressing a public meeting with Mr. Howe last Saturday night, to ask him if he recalled this situation, and he said: "Most emphatically so, and I gave similar assurance to Dr. Hogg and to Mr. Conant, previous to that, when he was Premier of Ontario."

Then of course, Mr. Speaker, the last authority I was going to bring to your attention is the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). I, too, say the responsibility for the power shortage is one which rests squarely on the Drew government and their successors, the present Kennedy government. You know, it is rather funny, when Mr. Drew was discussing this question so vigorously last session, he made this reference, as found on page 495, in referring to some remarks my friend, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). He said:

> "He fell a little short of something in referring to the 'Premier at that particular time' as one has to think quickly to decide who it was, because we had three in a very short time. It was a sort of process of musical chairs without music."

It is funny how these "chickens come home to roost" at times, because here on the treasury benches within a year we are evidently going to have three Premiers. I wonder if Mr. Drew, when he made that reference to the Premiers of a previous day being a sort of game of musical chairs without music had in mind that so soon there would be three Premiers on the Conservative benches as a "sort of game of musical chairs without music."

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE: (CCF Leader of the Opposition): History repeats itself.

MR. NIXON: Yes. But there is one question here which I want to bring up again. Of course, I am very sorry indeed the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) is not able to be here this afternoon. We all know where he is. The leader of this group (Mr. Oliver) in his speech made reference to a rather alarming, surprising statement made by Mr. Drew in this House a year ago when he said very emphatically in regard to this development on the Upper Ottawa River:

> "I emphasize that the present develment is a joint development,"

and went on to say:

> "The present development is a joint development which has some very interesting features which have been brought about as a result of that very high degree of co-operation existing between the government of Ontario and the government of Quebec. Under the arrangement which exists, the actual construction is being carried out by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission and it will be possible for the Quebec authorities to draw their share of the power if, in the future, they decide they wish that power."

Now, that is completely at variance with our understanding of the legislation that went through this House. When the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) was making his address, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, I asked him if the Province of Quebec had the right under

the legislation, or under any subsequent agreement that we know nothing about, to step in there and take one-half of the power developed on these developments on the Upper Ottawa, because if they have that right, it is a serious matter indeed, and one which we should know about in this House.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) said he would come to that later in his address. Then he finished his address and was going to sit down, and I asked him three different times, although he promised to give me the answer, if that statement by Mr. Drew a year ago was in accordance with the fact, and if Quebec had the right to draw on this power to the extent of 50 per cent. of that which is developed. The hon. Minister said: "Well, the government, in its wisdom—" may some day tell me. I do not know what that wisdom would be, but I think that was the word he used.

I do, say, Mr. Speaker, this House is entitled—

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: —to that information. I subsequently put a question on the Order Paper and that has not been answered, and I say the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) knew then, and he knows now, whether that is the fact or not, and we are entitled to know what the fact is in this House when the government is spending $10,000,000 a month in these great developments. Because, after all, that is the important thing, to get these developments completed. If you can step in any time you want the power and lay half the "cash on the barrel-head" and walk off with 50 per cent. of the power developed, that would be an easy way in which to acquire your power. Therefore, I do press upon the government to give us this information fully and frankly before the end of the session.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) also read again, for the fourth or fifth time in this House, some letters which were written by my former chief, Mr. Hepburn, back in 1937-38 to the hon. the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. King). There were references in it to "squeeze-play" and several other items. I am not defending the tone of the letter; at the particular time I had my difference with that gentleman, as some hon. members will recall. However, my recollection with regard to these letters is rather clear. We had undertaken to divert the waters of Long Lac and Ogoke from the James Bay watershed into Lake Superior. It was a costly operation, and it was our thought, of course, that in addition to the benefits we would get at that particular point of the province in the Thunder Bay district, we should have the use of the waters in addition to the waters to which we have the use by treaty rights down through the St. Mary's River, the Niagara, and down the St. Lawrence.

As Provincial Secretary of that government, it was my responsibility to place the matter before the federal authorities, and letters were written asking Mr. King to take the necessary action with Washington so that the right of the Province of Ontario to this additional water which was diverted from Long Lac and Ogoke would be recognized, in addition to the water which we had by treaty rights with the United States.

Mr. King took the attitude that this should be all dealt with in one submission, with respect to the development of the St. Lawrence Deep Waterways Scheme, but Mr. Hepburn was just as convinced that it should be treated as a separate submission. It was because of that attitude that he took the correspondence away from me and dealt with it himself. He was successful in getting that submission accepted at Washington and Ontario has the right to the water diverted from Long Lac and the Ogoke, and with all due respects to my friend, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox), I have no apologies to make to this House as a member of the government which was responsible for these diversions and I believe, down through the years, when we have the full development at Niagara under efficient development and the St. Lawrence, as well as up in the Thunder Bay and the

St. Mary's River, these two diversions will pay dividends very handsomely in the volume of power which will be developed because of that additional water available to the Province of Ontario.

That is the explanation, Mr. Speaker, behind those letters which have been read so often in this House.

With respect to the St. Lawrence itself, at the very first session of this House following the war, by motion of the Legislature, a delegation consisting of the Governor of the day, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Drew and the Premier, Mr. Hepburn, was asked to go to Ottawa and to place at the service of the Dominion of Canada the entire resources of the Province of Ontario. That resolution was carried unanimously and, while I of course was not present, I do know for a fact that the question of the St. Lawrence was particularly stressed, and it was indicated very strongly by Mr. Hepburn that we were certainly prepared to go ahead with the full development of the power at that time; and subsequently, after many conferences, in all of which I took a part, an agreement was reached with the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence, and I, as Provincial Secretary, and Mr. Hepburn as Premier, both signed that agreement in March, 1941. Therefore, to say he was opposed to the St. Lawrence scheme is not in accordance with the facts because his signature is upon the agreement. Unfortunately, Congress did not pass the agreement that time and has not to this day. I do think conditions are rapidly arising at the point where that agreement could be passed at Washington. I sincerely hope so and I have said in the past that I still hope to be in active, public life when the St. Lawrence Waterways and Power Development is accomplished. However, to do that you will have to go ahead a little faster than you are now. The hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) states you cannot expect this to be completed for 10 years after it is started, so let us hurry it along. It has my enthusiastic support and always has had.

I introduced resolutions in this House in 1926, when Mr. Ferguson led the government and when I first came into this House 30 years ago, it was a matter of current discussion. Our good friend, the Clerk of the House, who is here today, was secretary of an organization very actively promoting development of the St. Lawrence. That has been the situation for 30 years and I sincerely hope the present efforts, which appear to be extremely temporary, will be successful in bringing about that development.

We saw in those days, in regard to the St. Lawrence scheme, that it was not going to be any more successsul than it had been previously in passing the Congress of the United States. It just shows you how wise Mr. Hepburn was to have this other water matter, our recognition of rights at Lake Ogoki, dealt with as a separate issue entirely. The Hydro Commission was getting into very serious shape with respect to the development of our hydro resources and I took it upon myself, after many conferences with Dr. Hogg and Mr. Symington, at which I was present, to write a letter to Dr. Hogg in my capacity as Acting Premier of the Province at that time in the absence, through illness, of Mr. Hepburn. This letter is not of great length but those of you who know me intimately will certainly appreciate how serious I considered the situation to be before I would write such a letter to the Chairman of the Hydro Commission. That letter is to be found on page 696 of last year's *Hansard*. The hon. members can read it for themselves. I think it will be worth your while, taking into consideration who the author was, and I do not propose to take time to read it again. You will notice that it is certainly set out in no uncertain terms how serious the government of the day considered the situation to be. I even went so far as to practically instruct Dr. Hogg to forget the St. Lawrence for the moment and see if he could arrange an agreement with Ottawa, and the Province of Quebec, for development of the waters of the Upper Ottawa. That was proceeded with expeditiously and successfully.

In the following session in 1943, he

had the agreement already and the legislation ready to submit to this House and it was duly carried in spite of the opposition of the Conservative Party which voted against this agreement with the Province of Quebec for the development of the Upper Ottawa. The government of the day went out of office as a result of the election and my hon. friends came in.

After that nothing was done with respect to the development on the Upper Ottawa for at least two years and then a letter or two began to appear as passing between the hon. Premier of the province and the hon. Premier of the Province of Quebec, pointing out that we were becoming very short of power and the development should be proceeded with and development was started. The only trouble with that, Mr. Speaker, was, it was too late in starting to meet the requirements of this province and for that my hon. friends must take the responsibility, those who are members of that government.

There is the situation as I recall it and as I have undertaken to prove from the information which I have available. Of course, I have not access to the files of the government departments and the hydro that my hon. friends have, but my memory is very clear on this matter.

With respect to policies of the future, I see the hydro has undertaken what I consider a fairly adequate programme. I believe, at present, that an expenditure of $10 millions a month is made and that is about all that organization can handle. When we get this power available we will see what the situation is for the future.

I have never been too enthusiastic about the building of steam plants. In this matter, I know Dr. Hogg, for whom I always had the greatest respect for his engineering ability and advice, did not think we should tie this province up to coal from a foreign country. You never know what the price is going to be or what conditions are going to be in that country. Just yesterday, for instance, we saw a strike called because Mr. Lewis did not like the man the government appointed as Minister of Mines over there. I do not know what he would have done if he had been in the Province of Ontario, when the leader of that day promised we would have a Minister of Mines who was an outstanding authority on mines—

MR. FROST: Have you not?

MR. NIXON: —and he appointed a Lindsay lawyer who did not know a mine from a rat hole. Nevertheless, he is such a fine gentleman, but he certainly would have had a major strike on his hands had such authorities been active at this time.

Now, I would be less than fair, having said all that to the Hydro Commission and the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) if I did not acknowledge having had the very best of co-operation with respect to local matters in my riding in hydro service to the farmers. When I first came into this House 30 years ago, there was only one farmer in my riding that I knew of who was not adjacent to a centre of population, on the edge of a town or village, who had hydro. The cost was prohibitive under the circumstances. However, this progressed year after year, and I have, at all times, pressed strongly for the extension of hydro to the rural users until, I believe, we have reached a percentage of 98 per cent. in my riding. In this we have had the fullest co-operation of the hydro authorities.

Of course, I have never asked anything which was not fair and proper and never anything for myself, as yet. However, I am going to ask for something for myself very shortly. I have mentioned it before that we are serviced by an underground cable which was laid about 1923 or 1924, and has surely paid for itself by now. If any of the hon. members of this House suffered from the interruptions of power that we have suffered because of that form of service, they would have been objecting very strenuously long before this. Take last Sunday morning, for instance. Mr. Speaker, I wakened up at 6 o'clock, and there was no hydro, and I had to go out and help milk five cans of milk,

400 lbs., and if any hon. members know what a pleasant surprise that is on a cold winter morning, they will appreciate how angry I was. If I had had the hon. member from Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) with me I do not know what I would have done to him. We phoned the hydro station at Dundas, and they sent a gang out, who found that the moisture had reached the cable and ruined three feet of it. They had to go back to Dundas and get a section. By the time that was finished, it was noon and these workmen had been out all Sunday morning without breakfast and they were rather angry too. Then, of course, our domestic arrangements were disrupted. We had a house full of company and were left without the means of cooking breakfast, and you can imagine what the lady of the house would say to that. It was a mistake to ever attempt this sort of service.

I remember very well, when Sir Adam Beck came to the Cabinet Council Room with this piece of cable which was going to revolutionize hydro service. All you had to do was plough a furrow down the road and lay the cable and turn the road back on it. However, it was found that it was not perfect, that moisture got into it and as soon as moisture struck the wire at the centre of the cable, it shorted and blew the fuse and frequently melted the cable completely. I remember when day after day, and sometimes two and three times a day, we would have a power interruption when a fuse blew. When we put in a new fuse it was all right for several hours. Finally, it would not work and they could not repair it. After taking a day or two, they found one trouble was that a groundhog had dug a hole under and above the cable and had chewed away at the cable trying to remove the "roots" until he reached the live wire in the centre and he was electrocuted. This cable has been dug up and weakened by shovels and pick-axes and so on and our interruptions are numerous and most vexatious.

In some sections they have bridged it over, but it got so bad, it would not work with an overhead system. I do suggest that the time has come to do away with that service and give us modern overhead service. There are only two of us in that riding of Brant who get service from that. All the rest of the consumers are in the riding of my hon. friend, the Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley). I hope he will use his good offices to expedite this change in the very near future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will leave the balance of the matters I wish to discuss for the estimates. As I said, it was not my intention to go into the usual detail with respect to the statements which the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) so capably laid before the House in this Budget address. That has already been handled by the speakers preceding me. However, I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) on his usual, very able presentation of the Budget. It is reaching the magnitude which would give me some concern and I believe it gives him some concern. It is nearly 300 per cent. higher than it was when he took office, when the expenditures of the province were just about one-third of what they are today. I doubt whether we are getting value in improved government over and above what we had in those days. Nevertheless, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) did make a splendid presentation and he has my congratulations on that. He said in the old days when he was financial critic for the opposition that we were going deeper into debt with respect to the net debt of the Province of Ontario. Never did I think I would see him stand in this House as Provincial Treasurer and tell us the revenues have been most definitely favourable other than that the net debt increased by $27,000,000. That would have been $37,000,000 had you not taken $10,000,000 of the Surplus and applied it against it. Is that not a fair statement?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. NIXON: There is one thing which I criticize about the Budget of the present government and that is, there is no uniformity between one

Budget and the next. It is impossible for any critic to make an intelligent comparison. Had you taken that action last year you would not have had a $25,000,000 surplus, had the surplus been taken and applied against the net debts.

MR. FROST: Of course, we had no debt increase last year at all. We did not have any capital amount. We did some very wise financing. We used the back-log which we received from the Dominion Government and paid all our capital commitments so I had no other alternative but to put the $25,000,000 as a surplus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: That was a very embarrassing situation. Of course, we always have a very substantial debt in the Province of Ontario. I presume a surplus could always be applied to that purpose. However, I will leave the discussion of these figures to another opportunity.

I would just like to express my appreciation to the government for the grant to McMaster University of some $250,000 on capital and $100,000 for maintenance. I have long felt that this institution was doing a splendid job in this province and alleviates to some extent the job of our big university here and at Queen's. When I first raised this matter two years ago I was amazed at the reaction I received from McMaster University. They suggested I was criticizing them for not taking government fund. They should be praised for that attitude but I was not criticizing them, I was criticizing the government for not making more money available for them. However, I find two years after they are receiving funds, not with the same expression of appreciation and gratitude with which I think they should have accepted them. Nevertheless, they are accepting them and I think it is a splendid thing and I hope it will continue in the future. I have a very high regard for McMaster University—as has any dad who has sent a child there. As one of those who has done this I certainly know something about it, about higher education. I have sent three of them through McMaster so I should know something about higher education with respect to that matter anyway. I certainly have been more than satisfied with the results which have been obtained and I am glad these moneys will now be available for that splendid institution and they will be able to proceed with the capital development and for adequate remuneration of a very able staff. They have not been receiving a proper remuneration in the past.

I sometimes wonder about the surplus in the Supreme Court that my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) grabs now and then for $250,000 and where that money comes from. Surely, if there are funds in the reserves—

MR. FROST: It is pretty well all gone now.

MR. NIXON: —they must surely have been charging litigants too much in the past for services rendered, than is required to guarantee the demands of the judgment. $4,500,000 has been built up in surplus.

MR. FROST: That went back 30 years.

MR. NIXON: In any case I have no doubt the universities appreciate the moneys they received and possibly the litigants did not know that they were skinned in any case.

Well, that is all I intend to deal with at the moment, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you, Sir, and all hon. members for a very patient hearing.

MR. T. PRYDE (PC Huron): Mr. Speaker, before I start my remarks this afternoon, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of one of our members who so suddenly passed to his reward and whose earthly remains are being laid to rest this afternoon. It was a privilege to have known Walter Reynolds. I regret his death and I extend to his wife—that kindly lady whom many of us knew—my sincere sympathy. I think I can say this of Walter Reynolds—to

live in the hearts of those we leave behind is not to die.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I have listened very attentively to the speakers on both sides of the House, and have been impressed with many of the arguments of the hon. members opposite. Some of the criticism has been constructive and fair, most of it expressing the honest convictions of the speaker, but emphasizing the difference in political thought between the official opposition and the other parties of this House. For this purpose I do not include our friends of the LP, because I believe they are in a class by themselves.

The approach to most of our problems by the hon. members of the opposition is from the top down, in effect to set up a government with power over life and death, and it will tell us what is best for us. That is, the State is supreme. I need not mention specific instances where this argument has been advanced, because I think socialism means just that. There are many services the State must, of necessity perform, but there is a limit beyond which they should not go, and this is where we commence to disagree. Men's most cherished possession is individual liberty. This is a priceless heritage, a heritage we have gained through the sacrifices of our fore-fathers, who, for the preservation of individual liberty, endured hardships and sacrificed not only material wealth, but life itself. Here in Canada we know no master save the laws of the land; laws enacted for the protection of life, property and individual liberty; laws not thrust upon us by dictators, but enacted by legislators of our own choosing.

Today there are in Canada those who hold up to ridicule these established principles; who scoff at the virtues and the sacrifices of the men and women whom we Canadians revere as builders of our nation. Those unworthies who abuse the hospitality and protection of our institutions deserve the contempt of every right-minded citizen. We must not, however, harbour hatred against the misguided ones. Rather, let us conduct ourselves as becomes citizens of a free and enlightened country.

This government, being composed of human beings, is not infallible, and, of course, the opposition parties naturally wish to point out the mistakes. Frankly, it seems to me as if we, on this side of the House, see a great province offering tremendous opportunities to our people if they have initiative and the will to work. While, on the other hand, if we listen to some hon. members opposite, it would appear that this is the most backward, unprogressive land in the world—where everything is wrong and we are a retrograde people.

This is a rich province with boundless opportunities and, if we care to look around, we can see men at the top in almost every walk of life—industry, commerce, government, who have started with nothing, or very little of this world's goods, and today have reached the top. Mr. Speaker, the same opportunities still exist for those who have the will.

Still, there are those in our midst who, through circumstances beyond their control, do not have enough to procure the bare necessities of life, and I believe that all members of this House are concerned about those people.

I think, first, of mothers who have been left without the aid of a husband to raise a family. It was with satisfaction that I heard the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) say that greater sums were made available last year. I hope in our budgeting, still greater assistance will be given to these mothers, so that their children will have an even chance in the race of life. The Mothers' Allowance Act is a worthy piece of legislation and has not yet reached the limit.

Pensions to aged people, which are not contributory, is quite different. The present old-age pension is just a hand-out, but it is not so regarded by the general public. I am in favour of the $10 provincial bonus being paid to everybody across the board. However, I hope the day is not far distant when we will have a contributory plan, making pensions available to all our

people when they are unable to earn a living because of age. However, let me say a word on behalf of the many thousands of tax-payers in this province who have worked hard all their lives to provide for their old age.

I speak particularly to rural members this time.

Rural members know full well that our towns and villages are made up, principally, of retired farmers, who gave up farming, moved to town and expected to live on the interest derived from their life savings—in many instances less than $15,000. At present day rates of interest, that is less than $450 per year. That is what many people live on, augmented by some help from the farm and produce of their gardens, and now drawing on their capital. Alongside of this aged couple, an old age pensioner and his wife may live, drawing anything from $720 to $960 a year. Believe me, I don't for one minute suggest that an old age pensioner gets sufficient to live on at $30 per month and, personally, I have no hesitation in asking the Minister to consider an increase where circumstances require it. Better still, I hope a contributory plan will soon come into being.

What I want to emphasize is this: with a non-contributory plan, an even balance must be maintained between those who pay and those who receive.

Let me tell you I am speaking on behalf of many thousands of our citizens who have laboured hard throughout their lifetime to provide for their own old age, and have denied themselves many things to save enough to keep them in their declining years.

I have said a word for our older people. Now let me say something for our younger ones—the men and women who will lead this country in the future.

Education has been the subject of much discussion and a great deal of criticism has been levelled at the government in this respect. Some of it has been just—much very unjust. Statistics and figures can be made to prove anything, and much that has been said there has proven nothing. Teachers in this province a few years ago were woefully underpaid; because of low earnings superannuation has been totally inadequate; and school buildings in smaller places deplorable. Many teachers were being paid far less than common labourers. Let us keep this in mind. Teachers are engaged by local boards, and they are paid according to local conditions and the law of supply and demand. When a school board had to pay practically all the salary out of municipal taxes, they were considerably less than they are now—and the improvement is directly due to the policy of this government. To say that this government has implemented none of its promises is sheer nonsense. In this matter of education, it has gone beyond its promises. The situation would have been this, without greater grants, many schools would have been closed for lack of teachers and, because that situation has not arisen, is directly the result of the policy of this administration.

The creation of High School Areas, whereby the schools in rural districts will be comparable to city schools and where specialists can be employed at salaries comparable to the pay in city schools, is a tremendous stride in our educational system and a step in the right direction. By that I mean equality of opportunity for all the people.

I think the Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) adequately answered the charges of the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) in his complaint regarding university fees. The hon. member is a graduate of the University of Toronto, to which successive Ontario governments have made very liberal grants. Without them, fees paid by the students would be a great deal higher.

In effect, the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) was asking that university fees be virtually abolished. I oppose the principle altogether. When a young man or young woman has reached the age when he or she enters the university, they have also reached the age where a little work, particularly manual labour, is a good thing, not only physically, but mentally. As the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) said a few days ago,

many of our leaders in the country today paid their own way through university by working during holidays. You all know students who washed dishes in restaurants and did similar work to help pay their board while attending university.

I deplore talk such as the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) used in his address in this House. It was a plea to youth to look to the government to give them a little more—" 'gimme' something for nothing." One can easily get a following with such an appeal.

I would like, here, to read from a short article which I took from the *Reader's Digest*. It is written by E. T. Leech, Editor of the Pittsburgh Press, entitled the "Gimmes," and it says:

> "The whole world is being swept by an epidemic of the 'gimmes.' Nearly everybody wants to be given something at the expense of somebody else. This epidemic grows out of a belief that government can somehow provide aid and security for its people, no matter what the cost and how far in debt it already is.
>
> The more government provides, the more is expected of it. One of the penalties of government assistance is a widespread lowering of the sense of responsibility. Individual stamina and self-determination go down at a time when public expenses are going up. This parallel development has destroyed nations. It enabled a few thousand barbarians to overthrow the mighty Roman Empire. The Romans came to depend on the state for food, shelter and entertainment. In their eagerness for free security at the State's expense, they became so insecure they lost everything. A State is just a large number of individuals. In the end it is subject to the same limitations as the individual; it pays the same penalties for bad management. Take debt, for example. The U.S. Government owes over $250,000,000,000—more than $6,000 for every American family. Other political subdivisions—states, cities, counties, school districts—owe $20,000,000,000.
>
> All of them are under terrific pressure to provide more services and greater benefits. All are having to boost taxes and borrow money to pour out to a never-satisfied public.
>
> The popular idea is that these funds can be obtained from the rich and big corporations—so that the majority of people can have the benefits without paying the cost. But nobody gets anything for nothing. Everybody shares the debt. Everybody pays taxes—direct or indirect.
>
> There aren't enough rich people to enable the government to finance itself at their expense. If government took all the wealth of the corporations, it wouldn't put the country on a sound financial keel. But it would put the corporations out of business and workers out of jobs. Meanwhile, all that the big companies pay the government becomes a part of the cost of the goods they produce —an important factor in the cost of living for everybody.
>
> Only wider realization of these basic facts can stop the tragedy that must eventually happen if the give-everything-to-everybody theory continues unchecked."

Now, returning to my remarks about the university students, should we not rather appeal to youth in this way: this is your country. There are unbounded opportunities for those who have the will to work. There is still room at the top. Should they not be encouraged to ask themselves, "What can I give to this country, so that it will be greater still, so that it will keep its place in giving leadership in this struggling world?"

Let us keep this thought in front of the youth of this country—What can I give to Canada?—not, what can I take out of her?

Reference was made to the success of war veterans in their university courses. Their success is due to what I have said. These fellows had the spirit of giving. They had offered their lives for their country, and are carry-

ing that spirit into their university studies.

In London we have the University of Western Ontario, which is filling a wonderful place in the educational needs of the province. It is serving the richest and largest revenue producing section of this province, and is greatly in need of assistance in its programme of expansion. I am now making a plea to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to make provision for a substantial grant this year for that purpose. I repeat, this institution of higher learning is serving the needs of the greatest revenue producing section of the province—and in a manner second to none in the whole Dominion.

It is sometimes said: "Look well to the East." I say in this case: "Look well to the West."

There is one more subject in which the State can rightly make its contribution. That is public health.

This government has again pioneered in this respect. Hospitals are becoming more and more essential in the life of the average family and hospitalization is expensive to the individual. Many hospitals have been established through bequests by private individuals as memorials of various kinds, by religious institutions and municipalities. It is impractical to say the government should take them over and operate them. However, greatly increased grants have lessened the cost to the individual. The assistance given in the construction of new hospitals and the expansion of old ones has greatly increased the accommodation. In my own riding, three small hospitals have benefitted in grants for capital expenditure by more than $75,000, while grants for maintenance have increased from $2,870 in 1942 to $16,393 in 1948.

Let me say once more, that the mere voting of more money does not provide more hospital beds. Construction of the additions to these hospitals has been under way for two years but, due to shortages of men, materials and the proper equipment, they are not complete yet. Then let us not forget the shortages of nurses, which the voting of money will not correct.

County Health Units are being established with government aid which, I believe, will prove of great value.

There is something else which must be faced in the near future and which involves large expenditures of money. I refer to sewage systems in smaller centres. This is becoming a number one problem throughout Ontario and, like the cost of education, is too great a burden on property. This calls for immediate study by the Department of Health and the Treasury. Septic tanks, which are in general use, are becoming too numerous and are a direct menace to public health.

We may come to a business recession. I suggest that a programme of provincial assistance be worked out so that work of this kind can be undertaken on a large scale to prevent unemployment.

What I have suggested and the policies of the government I have endorsed here, are all the proper function of the State and I consider it a pleasure to support a Progressive-Conservative Government which will so guide our affairs so that money can be raised to carry out a programme of this kind and not cripple legitimate business.

Many of you have never been in the County of Huron or know much about that banner county. So, before I close, I will quote a few instances of where it excels and is, thereby, the leading county in the Province of Ontario.

As most of you know, it is largely agricultural, with several towns having smaller manufacturing establishments. It has also two important R.C.A.F. training stations within its borders, where many hundreds of our young Canadians are being trained for the same purpose that we have fire insurance—protection in case of need. They are fine young people, as is evidenced by the lack of crime in that part of the country. With their wives and families they form an important element in the life of the county.

However, the towns and villages to a large extent are shopping and trading centres for our industrious, educated,

honest, prosperous farming people. The people who raise the cattle and hogs and chickens and grain to feed the teeming cities buy the things you manufacture and sell.

Here are a few figures which substantiate my claim that it is the best county in the province.

STATUS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN COUNTY OF HURON

1947—ANNUAL REPORT OF STATISTICS BRANCH

Wheat	*Oats*	*Barley*	*Mixed Grain*
5th	3rd	3rd	4th

Flax	*Beans*	*Turnips*	*Butter*	*Poultry*
4th	2nd	2nd	4th	2nd

Swine	*Dairying*	*Beef Raising*
4th	4th	4th

It will be seen that, with such a variety, we have an extremely well balanced agriculture, one that is most unlikely to feel the effects of a crop failure.

Along the shores of Lake Huron we have beautiful beaches and summer resorts which attract thousands of tourists each year. The Blue Water Highway running along its shores is a scenic road, which is being improved from year to year by our Department of Highways.

I invite every one of you to visit Huron this year.

No government, under any known system, can accomplish all things at once, however necessary and desirable they may be. No government, under any known system, can attain to its best achievement without the full co-operation of all its citizens. Few governments are endowed with wisdom sufficient to enable them to lay down a long-range programme so perfect in design as to be carried to final completion without meeting reverses or without finding sound reasons for changes in original plans.

Mr. Speaker, I submit there is every reason for confidence that the future holds in store for all who deserve the name "Canadian," an enduring period of happiness, prosperity and security.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. D. THOMAS: (CCF Ontario): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take my part in the budget debate, I would first like to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), the hon. member for Victoria, on the able way he presented the budget address. I am sorry to say I cannot congratulate him on the budget itself. He certainly made a great play on the grants to the municipalities and stressed the great things this government has done since 1943. We and others in this Legislature were momentarily dazzled by the way the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) juggled those figures. It surely was a great display of fireworks, but now the smoke has cleared away, a great many who thought the government was at last ready to give assistance to the municipalities for social services, now realize there is very little of real assistance to help the already overburdened taxpayer.

The one mill subsidy which is now withdrawn cost the government $3,325,000 last year, is replaced by increased grants amounting to $6,300,000. Who will benefit from the grants on fire and police protection? Certainly not the rural areas, for most of these municipalities have voluntary fire brigades and low cost police protection and any grants they receive for these services would be much less than the amount they received on the one mill subsidy of last year. Admittedly the government has given the assurance that the municipalities would receive the equivalent of the one mill subsidy of last year, but they are not looking for an equivalent, they are looking for an increase. So you can't tell the rural people this grant on fire and police protection is likely to benefit them very much.

MR. FROST: They get the rural policing for nothing.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I beg your pardon.

MR. FROST: They are paying for the rural policing 100 per cent. It is

done by the Provincial Police. That makes a difference.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): As an illustration I will explain the position of the township in which I reside. Last year fire protection and police protection costs were $13,000. On a population basis they would receive in grants $3,250. The contribution to the Children's Aid Society and aged people through the county levy would still be lower than the one mill provincial subsidy they received last year. How can you tell these people it is a good budget?

MR. FROST: That may be the difference.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Wait a minute. How can you tell these people it is a good budget? The City of Oshawa with a population of about 27,000 people will receive this year 15 per cent. on fire and police protection. This one mill subsidy gave them last year $33,224 and under the new system of grants they will receive $38,010, an increase of $4,786 over 1948. With an assessment of $33,224 this increased grant would reduce their taxes 15 cents on every $1,000 of assessment.

MR. FROST: Is that not a series of two items of "police" and "fire"?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): No, it is a series of four. I also include the aged and the Children's Aid.

They cannot understand why this government should crow so much regarding this budget.

The aged people in the province are still asking for an increase in pension, and there is no relief for them. If the government had given this extra $3,000,000 they are giving in increased grants, to the aged people of Ontario with a porportional amount from the Dominion Government it would have been quite a help for these people at the present time, and it would help the government to fulfil the promise it has made to the pensioners each election since 1943, promises I do not think it has any intention of keeping. I am sure the people of Ontario riding, which I have the honour to represent, would want me to express their disapproval to the government for not considering the needs of the aged people before extending these measly grants on fire and police protection. Since 1946 this government has refused to give the municipalities the 50 per cent. subsidy on relief allowances given to destitute people on the grounds they are employable, and yet through no fault of their own they cannot obtain employment, they have no unemployment benefit, and we can't let them starve. The Provincial Government said it is a Dominion responsibility and vice versa, and with all this buck-passing the municipalities are left holding the bag and the maintenance of these people is the responsibility of the municipalities.

One thing I cannot understand is why the government should assume any portion of the cost of fire protection and police protection, for these services are definitely charges which should be met by real estate. I think the Provincial Government should recognize that unemployment relief, education, hospitalization, care of neglected children, and other forms of social security are definitely the responsibility of this government and it should keep within that field, giving assistance to services that real estates should not be asked to carry. Why are the grants to police and fire protection given on a population basis? The one mill subsidy and the grants on education have been given on an assessment basis. Why the change? Because I feel sure the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) would be the first to admit that the assessments in the different municipalities in the province are certainly not uniform, and it is impossible to give grants fairly and equitably on an assessment basis. The lack of uniformity in assessments in the province has proven to the government the need for reform in that direction. There are some municipalities in the province who have deliberately kept their assessment low in order that the grants on education would be high.

In 1937, when the province prohibited municipalities from collecting income tax and in return gave to the municipalities an annual one mill subsidy, the income tax field was a very lucrative one and the province was pleased to see assessments kept very low. The province at the time was not interested in the assessment of the municipalities and some properties were assessed as low as 30 per cent. of actual value; but the lower the assessment, the less the province would pay on the one mill subsidy.

In 1945 the government gave 50 per cent. toward the cost of education. The province did become interested in assessments, then, for it was at that time we find a great agitation for the appointment of County Assessors, and I think that was a step in the right direction.

Some counties with the encouragement of the Department of Municipal Affairs have adopted the county assessor system. The county of Ontario adopted this system of assessment four years ago. They have a very fine county assessor down there, doing a really fine job. Through the yardstick of assessment that he has introduced (an equalized assessment over Ontario County) the assessment in some municipalities has more than doubled, this is very noticeable in some areas adjacent to the City of Oshawa and through the adjustments in assessment the grants on education have been reduced at a time when the costs of administration are greatly increased. Some of these areas have no industrial or commercial assessments to help pay towards these high costs, and this must be met by the small home owner. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) should be concerned with this unfair system of assessment. Some may think the ultimate is a uniform system of assessment throughout the province. I think the Department of Municipal Affairs should encourage the equalized assessment even to the extent of enlarging their staff of provincial assessors.

Provincial assessors, if appointed, could go into the country and educate the local councillors on the need for a uniform system of assessment throughout this province. This certainly would help, but the giving of grants on the present basis is most unsatisfactory. I am sure the only solution to this problem as far as education is concerned is the provincial and the dominion governments must assume the full cost of education. That is the only fair way, satisfactory to everyone in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. THOMAS (CCF Ontario): In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think the government is making a mistake in its giving grants on a population basis. They should give all the financial assistance they can to unemployment relief, health services and old-age pensions, and leave the question of fire protection and police protection to real estate, where it rightly belongs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (L Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour in the session, I wish to avail myself of this first opportunity to offer you my felicitation upon your elevation to the august position of Speaker of this Assembly, and to wish you all due success in the discharge of the duties of your high office. I am confident that you will take great pains to acquit yourself of your duties at all times without fear or partiality as you have done to this date. I believe the hon. members of this House were well advised in selecting a minister of the Gospel and a man of God's choosing to preside over the deliberations of this House.

The hon. members of the government are always very prone to boast about their record of achievements. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you have also achieved a record in your own right insofar as you are the third Speaker to occupy your Chair in the very short period of a little more than three years. You will recall the first Speaker of the last Legislature was swept away from office on the crest of a wave of govern-

ment indignation over his vexatious and nefarious policy in handling admission tickets to the galleries of this House. Even to this day some malignant and biased minds, to be sure, are insinuating that his resignation was most heartily accepted, because by then his usefulness to the government had ceased.

You will also recall that at the following sitting, without the slightest qualm of conscience for the plight of their former colleague, the government of the day appointed a new Speaker, but he, in turn, was censured a few months later, by the electors of Prince Edward-Lennox at the last provincial election. He, nevertheless, deserves credit for his worthy contribution in creating a vacancy for you, sir, and by making way also for an additional Liberal member in this House, who has already given a splendid account of himself.

With all those past experiences still in mind, we of this group are looking forward to a very happy relationship with you, and we wish also that your tenure of office will last for the full term of this parliament.

May I be permitted now to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I have listened and read with great interest their maiden speeches. I am convinced that their contribution on the discussion of the affairs of this House will be of great help to all of us and at all times.

At this juncture, I would like to pay a tribute to the memory of the grand old man, the Dean of this House, who passed away last Saturday. He was possessed of a kindness of heart and serenity of judgment and a friendly spirit, which endeared him to everyone who knew him. I am sure we will all miss him in this House and that his memory will last for many years to come.

We were all deeply shocked when informed that two newly-elected members had died before taking their seat. I wish to express my deep feelings of sorrow and regret and to tender my most heartfelt sympathy to their respective families, to the government and to their electors.

Without the shadow of a doubt, the Province of Ontario and this House as a whole will experience a great loss and will feel much the poorer if our Premier gives way to his often-expressed intention of relinquishing his duties of office within the next few months. His genial personality, his invaluable parliamentary experience and genuine friendliness cannot be excelled or surpassed by any successor, whoever he may be. Accordingly, we are hoping he will reconsider his decision and that he will remain with us as head of the government for a few more sessions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: Former members will agree with me when I say the House has acquired a new look since dissolution. We have lost several members of great talents and we have acquired new ones of great distinction. The most notable absentee, to be sure, is the former Premier (Mr. Drew). He failed to make the grade, through the good grace of the voters of High Park.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: He has now left the provincial arena in quest of greater laurels. With an insatiable desire for greatness, he now entertains the dubious hope of reaching the heights of supreme power in Canada. After having gone through the battles of three provincial elections within five years, he is now about to enter another affray in the federal field. We trust and we hope that in his dealing with the Nationalists in Quebec and the Social Creditors in Alberta, he will not bring disgrace upon himself and upon the whole Conservative Party.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not worry.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will wait and see.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): You are not worried about that, are you?

MR. CHARTRAND: As yet, I have failed to hear any feelings of regret, as mentioned by some, since his departure from this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: I believe that none are in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: On the contrary, we should wish him many years of happiness in the discharge of long and faithful services to the nation as Leader of the Opposition at Ottawa.

I would like now to direct my remarks to the topics of social services, hydro and education.

At the outset of my remarks, I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by all members of the opposition, irrespective of their party affiliation, in advocating a supplementary cost-of-living bonus of $10 for all and every one of our old-age pensioners, and may I also add they should receive also free hospitalization and free medical care.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: We pride ourselves on being citizens of the greatest province of Canada, a land of unlimited resources, whose wealth and abundance are the envy of all the countries of the world, yet the very people who have toiled from morning till night and have contributed years and years of their lives towards the creation of this fabulous wealth, are being rewarded in the twilight of their lives with a paltry and miserable pension of $30 a month, which enables them but to keep body and soul together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

MR. CHARTRAND: I think it is a shameful treatment and a disgrace upon the House that we should tolerate this condition to exist any longer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take it up with St. Laurent.

MR. CHARTRAND: I beg your pardon? Who was speaking? We like to call Ontario the richest and the most progressive province of Canada, and it comes as somewhat of a shock when we find in some respects we lag behind some other province. An instance of this is the social services afforded by the Province of British Columbia. Let us for a moment compare their standards with ours, and more particularly with respect to old-age pensioners.

Commenting on the charge that we were spending $2 a day to keep inmates in jail and $1 a day for old-age pensioners, Mr. Arthur Ash, member of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, had this to say in the *Ottawa Citizen,* on or about the 31st day of January:

> "The Province of British Columbia takes second place to none regarding social security payments. Old-age pensioners receive a $10 cost-of-living bonus, bringing their total pension to $40 per month. In addition they receive free medical care plus free hospitalization under our new Hospital Insurance Act. Blind pensioners receive the same as old-age pensioners. Mothers' Allowances are granted by the British Columbia Government as follows:
>
> Maximum paid to single person, $35 per month.
>
> Man and wife, or parent and one child, $50 per month.
>
> Family of five, $75 per month.
>
> In addition to the above, they receive full medical care plus hospitalization under our new Hospital Insurance Act."

I think we could and we should, Mr. Speaker, follow the example of the Province of British Columbia, and grant to our old-age pensioners a supplementary cost-of-living bonus without waiting for any contribution from the federal

authorities. We could easily retain some taxes which are being abolished by this budget in order to raise the necessary $8,000,000 for such a worthy and deserving cause. May I say that any move in that direction will receive my wholehearted support.

I would like now to pass on to hydro. It is an incontrovertible fact that in the past we have suffered from a scarcity of electricity in this province, and in spite of the denials from the government benches, I believe we shall still suffer for some time to come from a lack of energy, which constitutes the very life-blood of our economic structure.

The minister in charge of hydro (Mr. Challies) has gone to great lengths to explain to this House that, with God's help and the rainfall, in addition to the co-operation of the Quebec authorities, we have averted an immediate crisis, and that by 1952, we shall be on the road to recovery. That may be so, nevertheless, the speech of the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) leaves many pertinent questions unanswered. We are told, for instance, that in 1943, the engineers of the Hydro-Electric System were of opinion that reserves should be built and recommended the development of the power sites on the Ottawa River. Expenditures in the amount of $1,000,000 were made on preliminary works. Very serious discussion and argument developed from then on as to whether the division of power as between Ontario and Quebec should be on a crosswise or on a lengthwise basis. The development which was started in 1943 will be finally completed in 1952, and yet we have not been given, to my mind, any satisfactory explanation to justify the delay in the light of the facts the Shipshaw development was carried out in a war year with full despatch and without any lack of priority for steel or other material. I believe Ontario could have done likewise and the failure to do so can only be predicated upon the lack of foresight, or else upon a faulty approach to the competent federal authorities for priority.

Reading from the speech of the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies), I find the following paragraph at page 136 of the Debates:

> "Our contracts for the delivery of power from the Gatineau Power Company and the MacLaren Quebec Power Company called for a total of 44,545,000 kilowatt power week. During the week ending November 16, 1947—to show how variable it is—when the supply of water was favourable we were able to purchase from these two companies a total of 51,932,000 kilowatt hours. That was in 1947. What a change there was in 1948. During the week ending November 14, 1948, we were able to purchase from these two companies a total of only 22,559,800 kilowatt hours, or 19,385,000 kilowatt hours per week less than in 1947."

Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, of the member of the government what kind of contracts they were with the Quebec power companies?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: We are being told we have close to 1,000,000 horsepower under contract, which represents about 30 per cent. of the amount of the power which the Province of Ontario receives from these Quebec power companies. During the recent black-outs, residents of Quebec, in the Ottawa Valley, were informed that, no matter what may come to Ontario, there would be no black-out in Quebec. Now, these two companies, the Gatineau Power Company and the MacLaren Power, are servicing the whole valley of Ottawa, the Quebec side as well as the Ontario side.

Further, Mr. Speaker, last month while listening over the radio to a broadcast delivered by the hon. Mr. Beaulieu, Minister of Trade and Industry for Quebec, we were told that his department had attracted new industry to his province at the rate of 1,000 a year for the last three years, and that they were expecting to do even better in the following year. He added that a survey of the power sites had been recently made, and that his government was

satisfied there was ample reserves to satisfy all future requirements.

He pointed out that if the company developing the iron ore in Labrador should make any request for any amount of electrical power, his government was ready to meet their demand at request.

Now, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies)—and I am sorry he is not in the House but he may answer when he brings down his estimates—may I ask the hon. Minister in charge of hydro, what is the nature of our power contract with these Quebec companies? Are we entitled to a percentage of their production, or only to their unused surpluses?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: Could it be that the government of the Province of Quebec includes in its reserves the amount of power now being delivered to the Province of Ontario? If the Quebec companies should refuse to make delivery of power, what is our recourse? Can we compel delivery, or not? Is it possible that the Ontario consumers might be cut off from 30 per cent. of their needed power by having some turned over to the Labrador region without any notice whatsoever?

In short, are they iron-clad contracts, or contracts which will hold neither water nor power?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: Mr. Speaker, these are all pertinent questions, which should be answered at the first opportunity.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Maybe they want to answer them now.

SOME MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHARTRAND: Mr. Speaker, we are also interested in knowing what share of power the Province of Quebec is, or may become, entitled to in the Des Joachims project and any other power sites that may be developed on the Ottawa River.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: Again, is there any satisfactory explanation as to why Ontario increased its power output by only 12 per cent. in the postwar period while Quebec and British Columbia increased their reserves respectively by approximately 30 per cent, in the same period.

Lastly, may I ask the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) if he really thinks we are out of the blackouts for good. If my information and my mathematics are correct I have the impression that we shall suffer from an acute shortage of power for several years to come. Here are the figures as stated in the *Montreal Standard Weekly* in one of its issues of December last.

By the end of 1947, Ontario Hydro disposed of 2,748,000 horsepower, made up of 1,793,000 maximum normal plant capacity plus 955,000 horsepower purchased. By the end of 1948, some 170,000 horsepower will have been added through developments at Stewartsville on the Madawaska River, Aguasabon in the Thunder Bay District, Ear Falls in Northern Ontario and power bought from Polymer Corporation in Sarnia. Earlier last year, and before it could know that the rainfall would be poor, Ontario Hydro estimated that it would be faced with a power deficiency of 400,000 kilowatts at time of peak, which is roughly equivalent to 500,000 horsepower. So, with 170,000 horsepower added for the year, it fell far below the expanded need in its building programme.

Presuming that the need will show the same percentage increase for the next few years that it has shown in the past, this year will raise that unfilled demand to something like 700,000 horsepower, with not a single major project coming into use in 1949 to relieve the emergency. And in 1950, the demand for new power will be close to 1,000,000 horsepower. The Ontario Hydro's present building project will not come into full force until 1950-51, when some 772,500 horsepower will be added, to meet a need which will be

well over 1,000,000 horsepower. So in 1951 there will still be an acute shortage irrespective of rainfall or lack of it.

But, as the critics point out, Ontario Hydro is committed to a programme of changeover from 25 cycle power to 60 cycle power. This programme is to cost in the neighbourhood of $200,000,000, and is in itself a tremendous undertaking, apart from the power crisis. A successful transition must involve the setting aside of reserve power. But such a provision involves further shortage. The alternative of proceeding without reserve could involve a major economic disaster which the hydro would not dare chance.

Most experts, inside and outside of Ontario Hydro, agree on one thing. The only permanent solution to the hydro crisis is the development of the St. Lawrence River power project at Morrisburg, Ontario. This would cost Ontario Hydro $214,000,000 and would yield Ontario some 1,100,000 horsepower. At present negotiations have reached the stage of approaches between the Federal Government of Canada and the United States. But President Truman has taken the stand of "no power development without a parallel waterways scheme." And the waterways scheme is bucked by powerful interests both in Canada and the United States who have everything to lose by such a development. They have successfully opposed it hitherto, even when the late President Roosevelt championed the scheme. There is no new factor which indicates they might fail to do so in the future. So that leaves the St. Lawrence power scheme precisely behind the eight-ball.

Few experts envy Hydro Chairman Robert Saunders his present job. If he can survive it, he may become another Adam Beck.

Without further delay, may I offer my sincere thanks to the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and the government of this province for the generous grants of $100,000 to the Faculty of Medicine of Ottawa University following a previous grant of $250,000. This institution is in the very heart of my riding, and if my presence as a Liberal member in this House has contributed in any way towards such grants, then I hope to remain for many many years to come the representative of Ottawa East so that this institution may continue to receive such grants for many years yet to come.

I have listened with great interest to the comments made a few days ago by the member of York West (Mr. Millard) in connection with civic assessment and provincial grants in relation to education. May I inform the House that competent and interested parties in our city have reached the same conclusions by the same process of reasoning. The picture in Ottawa so far as education is concerned is as follows:

In the year 1945 the Ottawa property assessed for Separate School purposes was but one-sixth of that assessed for Public School purposes. The Public School Board had more than $110,000,000 worth of assessment to tax than did the Separate Schools. The Separate School Board had slightly more than $28,000,000 worth of assessments in its favour.

The Legislative grants in vogue are not designed to assist more needy organizations. The Public Schools collected $313,000 in tax revenues more than did the Separate School Board and, in addition, more than approximately $97,000 in grants in the same calendar year than did the Separate School Board. Worked out by percentages, the Public School Board received 61 per cent. of the total grants paid to the two Boards while the Separate School Board received 39 per cent. This year the grants were reduced by approximately $25,000.

In 1945, the Public School Board in Ottawa spent $438,534.51 more than did the Separate School Board in 1944, to educate 1,795 pupils, average attendance, less than were accommodated in the Separate Schools. The average yearly cost in 1944 was $61.07. In the Public Schools, the average yearly cost in 1944 for each pupil was $130.49.

It cost the Public School Board $69.42 more than it cost the Separate

School Board in 1944 to educate a pupil. In other words, the yearly cost per pupil in the Public Schools was more than twice the cost in Separate Schools.

The Ottawa Separate Schools operates 72 more classrooms than did the Public Schools, and they had an enrolment of 1,580 more pupils in 1944 than the Public Schools, that is 54 per cent. of the school children in Ottawa attended Separate Schools, and 46 per cent. attended Public Schools.

The average salary paid the Public School teachers in Ottawa is more than $1,200 greater than the average salary paid to Separate School teachers. The repairs and improvements to buildings cannot be carried out for lack of financial revenues. The Separate School question has been agitated for generations. It has been made the subject matter for many political controversies and the merits of the case have often been obscured. We had great hopes at one time that the problem would be settled in a fair and equitable manner outside of the political arena, but I am afraid that the delaying action on the Hope Report, together with their proposed recommendation, will make it one of the major issues throughout French-Canada at the next federal election.

For the past eighteen months we have been told, on several occasions, that all the evidence had been adduced for this Hope Report. I think perhaps it should now be called—the "Hopeless report." The only remaining task is supposed to be to formulate the conclusion and to make the proper recommendations. Time and time again Mr. Justice Hope has informed the press that the report would be available within the next two or three months. It should be abundantly clear that the undertaking is beyond the Commissioner's capacity or else the report is being held back for ulterior motives. Whatever the excuses may be, I suggest to this House that by their delaying action the Commissioner now stands upon the horns of a dilemna before public opinion; either they have developed a complexity of mind which might be better described as the Babel of opinion and a confusion of language, in which case they should surrender their commission immediately, or else they have gathered the opinion that a condition of uncertainty and anxiety over the future of education has been paying such rich dividends for their party in the last provincial election that they are keeping the set-up to repeat the performance in the forthcoming federal election.

I further suggest to this House, as the Commissioners have been derelict in the discharge of their duties by failing to hold the necessary meetings to bring down their report before this day and afford an opportunity to the hon. members of this Legislature of implementing such recommendations as they might deem just and proper at this session and prior to a federal general election.

People at large are getting suspicious that there is some design of electoral conspiracy and the delay is being engineered by a member of the judiciary system of Ontario, under the advice of the high priest of the Conservative Party of Ontario and Canada.

In all events, if the subject matter of this report becomes a major political issue in the coming federal election, it will be very easy then to trace the responsibility for the delay and the timing. We will watch with great interest all new developments. My friends from the opposite side may think that I am taking a very gloomy view of the whole matter and that it is premature to pass judgment on it, or to entertain any pessimistic views at this early hour. I do not think so. There has been enough leakage to date to give us the outline of what the pattern is going to be. I have in my possession a clipping of an article published in the *Ottawa Citizen* on March 1st of this year by Frank Swanson, parliamentary writer, and entitled "Agitation over schools is not likely to end." I do not propose to read the whole article, but only a few excerpts which are quite illuminating, and which read as follows:

MR. PORTER: May I ask the hon.

member (Mr. Chartrand) a question? Does that article give any indication as to where the "leakage" came from?

MR. CHARTRAND: I think it came from Ottawa.

MR. PORTER: The article does not say so. It is just an article by a newspaper man, who did not quote any authority?

MR. CHARTRAND: Yes.

MR. NIXON: Your own Minister read a similar article on hydro.

MR. PORTER: Oh, that is not in my department.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are one of the gang.

MR. CHARTRAND: It reads as follows:

"If the report of Ontario's Royal Commission on Education takes, in some form, the character which is authentically indicated, the agitation over the status of Separate Schools in the province is unlikely to end.

"Information from sources in touch with the way things are shaping up suggests the improbability of substantial change from the prevailing situation, as regards the measure of State aid the Ontario Separate Schools receive."

MR. PORTER: That is a very nice way of putting it. Who are the "sources"?

MR. CHARTRAND: I have told you.

MR. PORTER: It does not say anything about "sources." What is the good of a statement like that? It is just hot air.

MR. CHARTRAND: (continuing)

"The Commission is divided between majority and minority views."

MR. PORTER: Does he disclose where he gets that information? No. Just hot air. Just hot air. The hon. members know the hon. member (Mr. Chartrand) should let the House know what he knows about this. He may have some further information from his own enquiries or his own connections in this matter, which would throw a great deal of light on that statement. If he has not, perhaps he should let us know.

MR. SALSBERG: Has the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) seen the report—

MR. CHARTRAND: I propose to deal with this matter a little later on.

"The information now is that a majority of the commission are against any substantial variation from the present system of financial aid and that, pretty much, the Separate School Boards will have to get along as best they can. That the principal aid to the Separate Schools should be either in proper proportion to, or at least with some regard to the actual financial need does not appeal to the majority, according to advice from informed quarters."

MR. PORTER: That is what he says. Who are the "quarters"?

MR. CHARTRAND: Let me finish my argument, and then you can ask questions.

This goes on:

"Here in Ottawa, recently, the condition of St. Patrick's Girls' School was the subject of agitation due to some alarm. The present school was considered a hazard by some of the parents, but the School Board is clamped financially, and the construction of new buildings is no easy matter under such circumstances.

"The present problem in the Separate Schools is essentially financial. Some time ago, there were reports that more assistance would be the outcome of the Commission's report. The later indications now are that the report is being prepared as stated with little likelihood of a change.

"This would be a severe disappointment to Separate School supporters. On the other hand, any widened

measure of aid would be resisted by those bodies which dislike the whole idea of Separate Schools and hold that the Public Schools should suffice."

MR. PORTER: Now, can you give us the authority for that?

MR. CHARTRAND: I will tell you where to get the authority, in about five minutes.

MR. OLIVER: He read the article and told you the name of the man who wrote it. What more do you want?

MR. PORTER: I would like to know who the "informed sources" are?

MR. CHARTRAND: Mr. Speaker, personally I have always been convinced that as far as my people were concerned, they were in for some great disillusionment if they ever expected anything worthwhile out of the Hope report. They are now about to realize that the high hopes raised during the last provincial campaign by way of insinuation or otherwise, were but a hoax, an eye-wash, a pretence and a sham practised upon them. The latest preview of the shape of things to come was a rude awakening to them, and the impact threw them into complete consternation. Accordingly they interviewed their fellow representatives in public life in order to enlist their co-operation, and on the 3rd of March the following statement appeared in *Le Droit,* of Ottawa:

"The only two French-Canadian members of the Federal Conservative Party, namely, Messrs. George Heon and Renaud Chapdeleine have definitely pledged themselves to secure justice for all the Catholics of Ontario, and for their French speaking brethren of Ontario, in the settlement of the Separate School problem, and in case of failure, they are resolved to withdraw their support of Mr. Drew and the Conservative Party."

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (PC Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) a question? Did you see a few days after, where they denied it? Your whole effort is to cause dissension?

MR. CHARTRAND: Thank you for that contribution.

MR. VILLENEUVE: Not much consolation in the last election in Quebec.

MR. CHARTRAND: It goes on:

"No denials whatsoever came from Messrs. Heon and Chapdeleine for the next eight days. Their stand and their pledges with all their implications were further confirmed by an article which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen,* dated March 10th, under the following caption, 'Two Quebec M.P.'s may desert Drew'."

The article reads as follows:

"Two new Progressive Conservative members of parliament from Quebec are threatening to pull out of the party, unless Opposition Leader George Drew uses his influence with the Ontario Government in controversial Separate School question, it was reported in political quarters today."

MR. PORTER: Who made the report?

MR. CHARTRAND: *The Ottawa Citizen,* on the 10th of March last.

MR. PORTER: Does it not give any indication as to the source of the information?

MR. SALSBERG: *Le Droit.*

MR. CHARTRAND: I told you it was the *Ottawa Citizen.*

MR. PORTER: The same old hot air.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should know about that.

MR. NIXON: Why did you not protest when your hydro commissioner (Mr. Challies) tried the same tactics?

MR. CHARTRAND: (continuing)

"The members are Renaud Chapdeleine, of Nicolet-Yamaska, and Georges Heon, of Argenteuil. Both

attended the Conservative caucus last week for the first time. Mr. Chapdeleine as a newly elected member, and Mr. Heon as a newcomer, after abandoning the rôle of Independent Conservative to become a 'regular' Party man.

"The members are taking the view that Mr. Drew gave certain assurances concerning the issue during the last provincial election, when his Party is credited with winning half a dozen seats in eastern and northern Ontario, as a direct result of promises to French-speaking voters.

"The fact that Mr. Drew is no longer provincial Premier, but now leader of the official opposition here, is of no consequence to the members. They are insisting that he use his good offices as a former Premier with the present Conservative Government of Ontario to get 'favourable' action concerning the school question which has been an explosive political issue for some time.

"The question revolves around two points: The first is the matter of a broader tax base for Ontario Separate Schools, many of which have a constant struggle to find funds to carry on. But an even more important factor is the still unpublished report of the Hope Commission on education in Ontario. This is the commission appointed by Mr. Drew himself in his capacity as Minister of Education four years ago.

"During his provincial election campaign, Mr. Drew indicated in his speeches that a solution satisfactory to Separate School supporters would be found. These statements were taken as promises by many Separate School supporters, and the resulting vote in some of the eastern Ontario ridings indicated that some people had placed such an interpretation on his remarks. There was a pronounced swing to the Conservatives."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHARTRAND: You should know whether that is true or not.

MR. PORTER: It is somewhat inconsistent.

MR. VILLENEUVE: They were tired of being fooled by the Liberals.

MR. CHARTRAND (Continuing):

"But under Premier Kennedy there has been some uneasiness developing on the question. Last week a delegation from the Ontario French Educational Association saw Mr. Heon and Mr. Chapdeleine and asked them to use their influence as new party members with Mr. Drew, who, in turn would be asked to use his with the Ontario Government. It is understood they promised to do this."

You should also know whether that is true or not.

"They want tax measures put through and also that the Hope Commission report be tabled without further delay. It is understood their view is that until these things are done, there will be no confidence amongst Quebec voters in the Conservative Party.

"Latest reports from Toronto indicate the report of the Hope Commission cannot be expected before June, or possibly even September.

"There are indications that Mr. Drew is not unaware of the dilemma, and that he realizes the grave political implications of the situation in Quebec."

That is your Leader.

MR. PORTER: What did your government ever do to solve this problem?

MR. FROST: Yes, that is a good question.

MR. PORTER: What did your party ever do to solve this question?

MR. CHARTRAND: You are the ones in power today, and Mr. Drew is the one who made the promises.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: You were here for nine years; what did you do about it?

MR. VILLENEUVE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) a question?

MR. CHARTRAND: If the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) will wait until I am finished, I will be happy to answer his questions.

MR. VILLENEUVE: Very well.

MR. CHARTRAND: On the very same day, while seemingly operating a strategic retreat which should really have been interpreted as a breathing spell for the new Leader to mend his fences, the two members involved issued to the press a well-prepared statement which read as follows:

"Mr. Heon and Mr. Chapdeleine signed this joint statement last night.

"The article, besides showing an absolute ignorance of the briefs submitted to the Hope Commission by the French Education Association, is a clumsy effort to embarrass Mr. Drew by injecting the Ontario school question into federal politics, whilst it should be honestly looked upon as a problem far removed from party lines.

"To start with, Mr. Chapdeleine and I are not at all thinking of deserting Mr. Drew on this issue, because we have found that during his term as Premier of Ontario, he has been most fair and generous to our Franco-Ontario friends."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARTRAND: (Continuing):

"Because Mr. Chapdeleine and I are Catholics, French-speaking Conservatives, and because by the people's will a good Conservative Government is installed in Toronto, it was quite natural for an important group of Franco-Ontario, highly interested and concerned with the Ontario Separate School issue, and with some isolated rural and urban school problems, problems to solve, to come to us to enlist our support in their suggestions. This we have and will always agree to do.

"In answer to a question put by a member of the delegation as to how far our support would go, we have stated and are willing to state again that we could not and we would not support a political party that would not treat our Franco-Ontario brethren with fairness and justice. What is wrong with that?"

AN HON. MEMBER: That assures Mr. Drew of their support.

MR. PORTER: You are not making many marks.

MR. CHARTRAND: I did not intend to—not with this government. My friends on the opposite side of the House may well wonder what is the meaning of all this agitation, and what are the implications involved. Frankly, I think there is "something cooking" in Ottawa, and if I were in the shoes of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) I would take a trip to our capital city in order to secure first-hand information. Later on, before introducing the estimates for his department, he could very well report to this House the nature of his findings and give us a complete account of what is transpiring, which would be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Failing this, I surmise that *Le Droit,* in its issue of March 3rd, made an exceedingly good diagnosis of the situation when commenting that:

"The event will have far-reaching repercussions in the forthcoming general election. If Drew's supporters can convince the Quebec electors that a satisfactory settlement of the school problem in Ontario has been concluded, the campaign may develop into a highly contested one. If, on the other hand, the French population of Ontario do not secure justice, in all fairness it is highly improbable that the Progressive-Conservative Party can make any worthwhile inroads in Quebec."

MR. PORTER: I suppose you hope we will not be able to arrive at a settlement?

MR. CHARTRAND: Well, no. You

know this report has been hanging for the last four years.

MR. FROST: You are just playing politics.

MR. VILLENEUVE: And cheap, too—very cheap; the cheapest we can get.

MR. DALEY: I hope you will never have to appear before that judge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHARTRAND: There you have it, Mr. Speaker, and again I say that the Hope Report should have been brought down long before this day, and new legislation enacted on education. The chips are down now, and it may well be that the fate of the Conservative Party in the federal field, also of French Canada, is being played at this session, and in this House.

From now on you are expected to redeem the pledges made by the former Premier, George Drew, now the Leader of the Opposition at Ottawa. No amount of pussyfooting, of subterfuge, and of masquerading will measure up to the task at hand.

The electors in French Canada will have no more testimonials of friendship from the Conservative Party by way of promises, flowers and soothing words. Nothing short of deeds and facts will satisfy them. They will not be contented solely with a report which may be pigeon-holed at will, but they shall demand their proper legislation put on the statute books of this province.

MR. PORTER: Who is running this province, anyway?

MR. CHARTRAND: If you have made up your mind to play fast and loose, to blow hot and to blow cold, to approve and disapprove at the same time, depending upon the surroundings, then I say to you that you may not expect to pull the "hat trick" at the next general election. For whenever human rights enter into conflict with proprietary rights, we shall always vote for the parties and the candidates who shall stand for human rights foremost and above all.

As matters now stand, you are about to enter into a political campaign with empty hands and broken pledges toward French Canada. The hon. Minister for Education (Mr. Porter) has been telling us that everything is going well with the Commissioners on Education, and the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) of this province has been referring to inquiries lasting over a period of twenty years. If such is the case, then I would suggest that a letter be sent forthwith to the commissioners thanking them for nothing at all over a period of four years.

MR. FROST: I did not say "twenty" years.

MR. CHARTRAND: You said a Commission on Education had taken twenty years.

MR. FROST: Oh, that was in England.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, no; a number of different committees.

MR. CHARTRAND: Now, to sum up my views of the subject, and to bring my remarks to a conclusion, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it is my unshakable conviction that if the Conservative Party is not prepared to serve the cause of national unity by a full and complete recognition in the spirit and in the letter of the rights and privileges of the diverse elements which make up the population of Canada, if it is not prepared to recognize the unfettered rights and freedom of parents to raise and educate their children in the language of their choosing, if they do not believe in the principles of social security, and social security in education, by affording an equality of opportunity for every child in the province, irrespective of race or creed, then I say to the Conservative members, they may go to French Canada to sing their dreams, bearing with them gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh, but they shall sing their dreams at all times to the hollowness of our minds, our hearts and our souls.

You have in the folds of your minds the solution to this challenge, and we shall await eagerly for a frank and fear-

less expression of it prior to the forthcoming federal general election.

I thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6 o'clock, I do leave the Chair.

It being 6 of the clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at 8.00 p.m.

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (PC Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, the hon, member for East Ottawa (Mr. Chartrand) has said he would answer a question, but due to recess time I did not want to delay the House. Would it be quite in order for me to ask him that question now?

Since your whole speech was trying to—

MR. A. CHARTRAND (L. Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member (Mr. Villeneuve) is going to make a speech, I object; if he wants to ask a question, all right.

MR. VILLENEUVE: You admit the Conservative Government under the hon. George Drew gave the Ottawa University $240,000 grant last year.

MR. CHARTRAND: I said it in my speech.

MR. VILLENEUVE: Can you tell me how much grant was received under the Liberal Government by the Ottawa University from 1934 to 1943?

MR. CHARTRAND: I was referring to the promises made by the hon. Mr. George Drew at the last election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nothing.

MR. CHARTRAND: That is elementary.

MR. D. H. MORROW (PC Carleton.: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this budget debate, may I avail myself of the privilege given the other hon. members today in offering you my sincere congratulations on your elevation to that high office. I can see by your record to date you are not insensible to the exalted duties of that office and I have every confidence that you will continue to carry them out with distinction and honour, not only to yourself, but to this House as a whole.

May I be permitted also, Mr. Speaker, as a new member, to pay tribute to my illustrious predecessors who have represented the constituency of Carleton in this House for many years. I refer to the late R. H. McElroy, the late Hon. Robert Grant, Minister of Education in the U.F.O. Government of the day, whose family and relatives still live in the riding, and also to the veteran Holland Acres.

I feel it is not only my duty, but desire, to express the gratitude of all the people of my county for the splendid public service these men rendered, as representatives of my constituency in this Chamber, over the many years. I hope that I may, in my own humble way, measure up in some degree to their worthy efforts.

In the course of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I intend to cover briefly the topics of Agriculture, Health, Rural Hydro and Education, as mentioned in the Budget, and to relate these subjects as they affect my riding in particular and the province in general.

Carleton, Mr. Speaker, is an old and historic riding, for provincial election purposes it includes the western portion of the City of Ottawa and the county proper, with the exception of two townships which are attached to the riding of my good friend, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault).

I remember when Carleton, for the most part, was a rural riding, but today, due to the rapid growth of the City of Ottawa, south and westward, it has become an urban riding as well as rural, and, in fact, it has become more urban than rural. Beside the farmer, we have the civil servants, business people, trades people and industrial workers in many suburban industries. All in all, we are a truly representative group, working harmoniously together for the good of all, regardless of race, religion or social position in life.

The farmers, for the most part, are engaged in mixed farming. They have fertile farms, stocked with excellent herds of dairy cattle, shipping their milk to the cheese factories and the dairies. Some specialize in the buying and selling of cattle, which, until the last few months, has proved very profitable work for a number of years.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as a member of a constituency representing an extensive rural area, I was pleased to see the Budget offering generous expenditure for the insuring of greater security and the well-being of those engaged in agriculture. Agriculture is recognized as the bed-rock of our economy and the sure foundation of every job, whether it be in the city or on the farm, or in the mines and forests. In Ontario, 500,000 people depend directly upon this industry for their livelihood, thus making it essential that every aid be given in order to make it a thriving and prosperous industry.

I have noted that one of the guiding principles of this government, for the past number of years, has been to present a budget offering generous support to new projects and policies leading toward improvement in the welfare and betterment of this industry. This Budget, in my humble opinion, still follows that sound principle, and it is my fervent hope that future budgets will continue and expand it in order that farming may further development as a profitable, pleasant and attractive way of life.

The Federation of Agriculture has been active in my county and in cooperation with the county agricultural representative is doing excellent work. I agree, whole-heartedly, with the sentiments expressed in this House a few weeks ago by the hon. member from Grey South (Mr. Oliver) that there is a growing appreciation of the value of this organization among the thinking farmers of the province today.

I anticipate that practical help for the farmer in my constituency will come from this Budget in the form of improvement and control of various aspects of the industry, subsidies to improve the production and quality of the farmer's products and financial assistance in the form of grants and prizes, which, in my county, will aid the agriculture fairs, tile-drainage, field days, plowing matches, activities of the Junior Farmers, agriculture course, community halls and so on.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that this help is given in the certain knowledge that a strong, stable and organized rural life is necessary to the future growth of this basic industry in the province.

At this point I would like to say a few words about rural hydro. I was pleased to hear the special emphasis placed on this subject in the budget, as it affects many urgent cases in my riding and as I am sure it does in most of the hon. members' ridings throughout the province.

Statistics show that during the year 1948 the commission constructed well over 3,000 miles of rural hydro lines and provided service to approximately 30,000 new rural consumers, with a total expenditure of $24,000,000, including the government grant-in-aid of some $12,000,000.

The commission's 1949 programme calls for the construction of approximately 3,900 miles of lines to supply nearly 40,000 new consumers, the greatest rural expansion in our history. I mention these figures, Mr. Speaker, only to emphasize the expansion of this work, and I might go further, to show that of some 224,000 rural consumers of hydro in the province, approximately 160,000, or 65 per cent. of them, were added in the past five years since this government came into power; a truly remarkable record, in my opinion, and one worthy to note in this day when the hydro is being so severely criticized.

The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of this province is in the midst of the greatest drive in rural electrification in Ontario history. Last year there were practically 500 miles of lines built in eastern Ontario, and I am particularly pleased to see that this year the programme has been stepped up to a far greater extent.

In recent years, some of the larger municipalities in the Ottawa valley have joined the hydro family, and with the amount of hydro development going on in the province, there is no doubt in my mind that with the industrial development and unprecedented growth that Ontario is enjoying at the present time, a large amount of this will come to eastern Ontario. In that triangle between the converging confluences of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers, where all the features favourable to industry are available, good rail transportation, good roads, an abundant supply of low-cost power, and so on, I would like to prophesy that this section of the province will have a greatly accelerated increase in population and industrial activity at a rate never dreamed of before. This situation, Mr. Speaker, would, in my humble opinion, bring much needed prosperity to us all.

True, new rural hydro subscribers are having, in some cases, difficulty in getting service. Area managers in my riding have shown me how short they are in certain key materials such as: aluminum cable, spool bolts, top pins, and so on. It is regrettable that these shortages have caused considerable delay in energizing many lines. However, I am assured by these managers that service will be given at the earliest possible time, when key material shortages have been restored.

Thus, the benefits of cheap light and power are pouring into Ontario's flourishing countryside. The rural electrification plan is expanding at a rate never before approached in the history of this province and giving to the rural people the use of electric stoves, refrigerators, washers, milking machines, milk coolers and all the other electrical appliances that take the drudgery and inconvenience out of the farm and village life, and making this great province the most highly electrified area in the world.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that future budgets will indicate an even greater grant-in-aid programme until this whole province, from the Manitoba border to the Quebec boundary will become a panorama of lights by night, not only illuminating the homes, rural schools, hamlets and towns, but even the heavens themselves.

The government, Mr. Speaker, is to be congratulated for taking greater steps, through our capital and maintenance grants, to expand and better our hospitals in the province. These generous grants are giving the impetus to many municipalities to do something about their local hospital accommodation problems.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question in connection with hospitals? Is the $50,000 that you have been promising some of the voters and communities in Carleton, the same $50,000 that the Conservatives have been promising for the last 30 years?

MR. MORROW: I am sure the hon. member from High Park (Mr. Temple) must have heard somebody else mention the figure $50,000. I have not myself, but I know that the County of Carleton is badly in need of a hospital aid programme, and we intend to do something about it in the very near future.

County hospitals are essential, if we are going to have any country doctors. The country doctor requires a place where he can take his very-ill patients and look after them himself; a place where both the patient and the physician have the benefits of scientific equipment and modern hospital facilities. Very few qualified physicians will come to the country to practice without a hospital. It is only natural that they prefer the convenience of a city practice to that of the difficulties of rural life. Therefore, it is good to see this government encouraging the construction of more rural hospitals to attract doctors and nurses to the country, and give the best possible health service to these people.

I mention this subject, Mr. Speaker, only in the hope that the present hospital-in-aid programme will serve as a basis to spark a solution to the hospital accommodation problem in my own riding. Carleton County has not, at

present, one hospital bed of its own, and its doctors have no place to take their very sick patients and look after them, themselves.

MR. W. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): They have been voting the wrong way, I guess.

MR. MORROW: The only semi-open hospital serving the area is the Ottawa Civic, located in the city section of my constituency. It is over-crowded and being used beyond capacity and admission, and as a result of this situation, it is difficult, and often impossible, for those living outside the city limits to secure accommodation and, when they do, I might add, they pay an extra $2 rate, which in the case of private patients, amounts to $11 per day. The particular situation, Mr. Speaker, causes a very great hardship, both physical and monetary, upon the people of the county.

According to the Chairman of the Medical Advisory Council of this hospital, the hospital accommodation problem in the area is likely to grow worse in the immediate future. The obvious answer, as I see it, is another hospital, one that would be large enough to accommodate not only patients from the urban municipalities, but from the rural municipalities as well.

The government, Mr. Speaker, has the programme in existence to pay their share of such an undertaking, and I am hoping that the local authorities will get together in the not-too-distant future to work out a proper solution to this problem.

It is idle for us to talk of national health insurance, until we have the hospital accommodation in the country to take care of such a scheme. I believe the present hospital programme of the government, is going a long way in bringing about this accommodation, and perhaps, in the not too distant future, the basic problem confronting us today namely, the staggering costs of medical and hospital treatment, will be solved by the introduction of a comprehensive health scheme on a national basis.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not provincial?

MR. MORROW: Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words about education. It is encouraging to note from the Budget that almost $37,000,000 for grants is to be paid to the school boards of Ontario this coming year. These ever-increasing grants over the past few years have resulted in far-reaching betterments in our educational system. If we reverted to the system of grants which we had in this province a few years ago—particularly when the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand), his party was in power, and at the same time retained the service we have today, the additional burden on the real estate owner of the province would be heavy indeed.

In my own county general school-board grants have increased from $275,000 to over $1,000,000, a truly remarkable improvement. These grants have enabled the school boards to do things that were financially impossible to accomplish beforehand. Because of the increased provincial grants, school boards all over the province have been able to construct sorely-needed school-room accommodation. I mention only my own school section, as an example, where the school board has built and officially opened two new school wings at an approximate cost of over $400,000, which has alleviated a very over-crowded condition. Such an undertaking in our area would have been financially impossible under the old system of grants. The modern schools now being built all over the province are the direct result of this new government policy of sharing the capital costs. And no matter what the Royal Commission on Education may report, these schools, in my humble opinion, are the last word in architectural design, heating, lighting, school equipment and recreational facilities. I cannot see how these pleasant and healthful surroundings could be improved upon by any report.

By the same token, Mr Speaker, school boards have improved the teachers' salaries and security, and thus in-

creased the dignity of the teaching profession. I would like to offer myself, Mr. Speaker, as an illustration of this noticeable improvement. My male colleagues and I have two suits of clothes instead of the one which had to serve all purposes heretofore.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, you are in black.

MR. MORROW: By the salary that was raised we now have one for weekdays, and an extra one for Sundays. Such lavishness in wearing apparel for teachers was unthinkable a few years ago. Besides, the dignity of the profession has reached such a high level today, that members of my honourable profession are elected as members of Parliament, to grace this Legislative Assembly. I consider this a truly remarkable improvement in our social status, and one for which I am most humbly thankful. It is true that during the war years, and since cessation of hostilities, there has been a dominion-wide shortage of teachers. But from information that I have received, Ontario has suffered less than any other similar area. This has been caused, as you know, by many reasons—I mention only wartime dislocation and inadequate salaries, being the two major factors. However, I believe that with the present general increases in salaries, the better superannuation legislation now before the House, the ever-increasing new and better-equipped school buildings, and the lessening insufferable interference in personal affairs, will all have a noticeable effect in recruiting better and more adequate staffs to our schools.

From my experience, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that no government in the history of any province has done more for education than the present one, and I would like to associate my remarks with those spoken the other day by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) that much credit is due to the vision and leadership of the former Minister of Education of this province, the hon. George Drew.

Somewhere, Mr. Speaker, I was taught that one should defend his brother in his absence. As you know, Mr. Drew is my co-member in Carleton. I had hoped to do this, but the opposition has been pulling his skeleton out of so many closets in this session, and on so many different occasions that I have shrunk from the task.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Tell us about "Holly" Acres.

MR. MORROW: My hon. friend from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) mentioned my worthy predecessor. I might say that I accept with thanks the touching tribute that he paid to him a week or so ago in giving his obituary testimonials to departed members on this side of the House that I am going to take that message to him at the very earliest opportunity, but I warn him if the thank-you not is not phrased in just as palatable a vein as the tribute was, I don't want him to lay the blame on me.

MR. SALSBERG: I will take care of Holly Acres any time.

MR. MORROW: At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that any person or persons who have been associated with education in this province for the last number of years, will gladly join in defence of the enlightened educational policy that developed under Mr. Drew's strong, guiding hand during his term of office.

Now, I am not saying that our system is perfect. Far from it. We must progress with the times. I think, perhaps, that the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) had a point the other day when speaking of trade-schools. You know that the Canadian Vocational Training School, implemented for servicemen during the war and afterwards, when they took some training on the job in the technical schools for trades and industry, that it had its merits, and I think perhaps that this still could be elaborated upon in our Technical-School set-up of today.

But I do say this; that after studying the different educational systems of this country and of some countries

abroad, both from the textbook and by visiting their schools and universities in person, it is my considered opinion that we rank second to none. We have no apologies to make. Our record is in black and white, for everyone to see.

But, fine as our record is, Mr. Speaker, we are not a government of the past, but of the future. Ontario is marching relentlessly forward and upward. On every hand is expansion and development. Let us make progress by sound, sane and responsible legislation, for the good of all of our citizens of the province today, and for the benefit of succeeding generations, the men and women of tomorrow.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with housing, a matter which I am sure has given hon. members on both sides of the House a considerable problem over the past few years. I want to deal in particular with the section in my own riding, known as the Regent Park section, which will become the first section in the dominion where the slum area is being removed and replaced by a housing development. I would like to go back to the history of this development. The development started back in 1944, before the end of the war, when this city authorized its Planning Board to make a study of the area and report on that study. That report, which was adopted in principle by the Council of the City of Toronto that year, stated that in this area at that time, 3 per cent. of the people paid less than $10 a month rent; 12 per cent. of the people paid from $12 to $14 a month rent; 33 per cent. paid between $15 and $19 a month; 29 per cent. paid $20 to $24 a month; 17 per cent. paid between $25 and $29 a month and the balance paid up to $30 to $35 a month. That left, at that time, an average monthly rental of $21 in Regent Park area.

The Planning Board, at that time, recommended that any new re-housing scheme in that area would have to provide houses at an average rental of $25 a month. On that basis the city proceeded with the plan.

On June 17, 1946, it was estimated that the best they could do was to provide two unheated bedrooms for $34 a month; three unheated bedrooms at $38 a month, that is, a unit with that number of bedrooms. For heated premises the price would be, with one bedroom $35 a month; with two bedrooms $43 a month; with three bedrooms $50 a month. That was the proposition which was voted on by the people at the city election on January 1, 1947. At that time it was estimated that there would have to be a subsidy in order to make it possible for the people living in this area to rent the houses. There would have to be a subsidy of $20 per dwelling unit paid by someone. The basis on which they proceeded to estimate for subsidies was on assistance in getting the land from the owners and building the houses. The proposal, at that time, of course, was that the whole housing development be given over to Housing Enterprises Limited, which was organized by certain investment and insurance companies. Following Mr. Howe's challenge at the end of the war, when Mr. C. D. Howe said to these companies: "You people believe in free enterprise, then prove that free enterprise can provide housing for the people. Show us a housing company or association which will build houses people can rent." They took Mr. Howe up on that challenge and formed Housing Enterprises Limited. The basis of that agreement was that the province—I do not think they ever got a real promise from the province—but they hoped the province would give $400,000, the City of Toronto would give $400,000, and the Dominion Government promised $800,000, a total of $1,600,000. This was to be used to purchase land and clear the land.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Secretary): Mr. Speaker, did the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) not lead a deputation to the City Hall at that time opposing any such development?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, yes, I will be very glad to answer that question.

MR. PORTER: But you changed your mind now.

MR. DENNISON: I have not changed my mind and I will tell you the reasons why.

MR. PORTER: But you did oppose it?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, no I did not oppose the proposal as such.

MR. PORTER: You opposed it.

MR. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, the deputation I led to the City Hall was to say that the people should be given representation—

MR. FROST: You opposed the scheme. Trouble-making again.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I was not "trouble-making." The statement we made and the statement of the deputation of Regent Park ratepayers were that they wanted a genuine low-rental housing project. They did not want rentals which would prove to be too high for them to pay. At this time let me remind the government the building cost was $4,200 per unit and they proposed to build 971 units.

Let me follow this just a little further. Today the unit cost has increased very, very greatly, up to $8,000 per unit, while the subsidy we get from the province is not increased. That is the story I want to tell this House.

The government has only given to this development $56,000 or $1,000 per unit for 56 units. What about the other 900 units?

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I suppose the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) knows why?

MR. DENNISON: If you could tell me why, I would be glad to hear it.

MR. PORTER: The reason is perfectly simple, Mr. Speaker. The Regent Park project covers an area where there was some vacant land and where there are a great many existing houses, some of them of fairly good quality, with many home owners living in them. It was considered by this government, as it was by the council of the City of Toronto, that if we were to contribute anything towards any housing project, it should only be contributed to the extent of providing additional housing accommodation. If it were simply going to tear down 900 houses and put up another 900 houses, there were several places to do that, and not use all that material and tear the existing units down without gaining any housing accommodation. Therefore the contribution of this government went to the number of houses which could be placed on land which was then vacant and materially increase the aggregate housing investment of that area.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, does the government mean to say that it does not intend to give any more than this $56,000?

MR. PORTER: I told you.

MR. DENNISON: They are proceeding to tear down units.

MR. PORTER: Are we going to tear down units and put other units in their place? We want to give additional housing.

MR. FROST: You want to add to the 30,000 homes built this year.

MR. DENNISON: The government wants to stop at the end of the vacant land and go no further at this time. $56,000 is your limit?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, no, I have made it perfectly clear and the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) knows it. The hon. member (Mr. Dennison) led a deputation to the City Hall, not on the grounds we are speaking about now, but because he was concerned a lot of people were afraid they were not going to get sufficient compensation for their land.

MR. FROST: Just to throw a monkey wrench.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, that is not true. What the hon. Minister

(Mr. Porter) is saying is only part of the picture.

MR. PORTER: But it is true.

MR. DENNISON: We wanted the people to get a fair return.

MR. PORTER: Exactly. That was the reason and you know it.

MR. DENNISON: You would not ask the people in Regent Park to bear the cost, to take a loss on their selling price for this project?

MR. PORTER: Who said they would?

MR. DENNISON: That is what you are suggesting now.

MR. PORTER: No, I was not.

MR. DENNISON: That is exactly what you are saying now. Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter), let me tell you that your grant at the present time, when the need is greater, is actually less than it was back in 1946 when it was proposed. At that time you would give $400,000 to this project. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to criticize the City of Toronto. I think the mayor of Toronto and the Housing Board and Toronto generally have done a good job in housing. They have gone out of their way to provide housing and should be given credit for it. The City of Toronto on its own hook, without any assistance from the province, has made possible an additional 1,100 units at Malton, GECO and elsewhere, and they deserve credit for what they have done.

What I want to say tonight is, will the government not contribute to a greater measure? Let me take the present situation. Last Wednesday, I had a deputation from Regent Park visit me in connection with the present situation in Regent Park, and here is where the tragic story begins to unfold.

Let me say that even the report which the hon. members of this House received for Regent Park, published by the Civic Advisory Council of Toronto—

MR. PORTER: What date was that?

MR. DENNISON: —states that the average rental will only be $28.67. Now, we would be satisfied if that was the average, but I am afraid it is not the average. One man who visited me last Wednesday, a blind man with a family of four, now pays $19 a month rent. He will be asked to pay $63 a month rent under the present rental rates.

MR. PORTER: Who are you blaming for that?

MR. DENNISON: That includes service charges. Number 2; a family of five, now paying $18 a month rent will have to pay $62 a month rent, including service charges.

A family of 6, now paying $18 a month rent will have to pay $72 a month rent, including service charges.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these rents are not low-rental housing at all and they cannot be called "low-rental housing." I am very disappointed that there is not enough subsidy being paid by this Provincial Government to make this a genuine low-rental housing scheme. I want to give you an example of what low-rental housing should be.

MR. PORTER: May I ask a question?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Dennison) is opining that the new houses which are going to be built will replace these low-rental houses that are there now. You say that when these houses are torn down and new houses are put there, the people are going to be called upon to pay very much higher rents?

MR. DENNISON: That is right.

MR. PORTER: Then, why tear down the present houses?

MR. DENNISON: Because they are slums.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, some of them are very satisfactory houses.

The people in them have told me. They are very cheap to live in, and perfectly clean and perfectly good, low-rental houses.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter), I understand this government was behind this project; that you were going to support it, and were prepared to go all the way with Toronto in making this a genuine low-rental scheme. That is what I am trying to show you. I am trying with all sincerity to make this a low-rental housing scheme, and I suggest that your subsidy is not enough.

MR. PORTER: Would the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) suggest we should pay any more than we did for those houses that were built? Was that not a very generous subsidy, a $1,000 a house; a free gift; no strings attached to it? $1,000 a house. What is the matter with that? Why let a Provincial Government go any farther than that with a lot of farmers' money?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, in 1946, you promised $400,000—

MR. PORTER: We never promised anything in 1946.

MR. DENNISON: You did not promise anything?

MR. PORTER: No.

MR. DENNISON: Well, we were led to believe you did. We are disappointed in you, Mr. Minister.

MR. PORTER: Not in 1946.

MR. DENNISON: Remember, these rentals include hot water, they include refrigeration, but they do not include hydro, which is extra.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is in hot water.

MR. DENNISON: In addition to the rentals, the tenants have to pay hydro and gas extra. Let me tell you what real low-rental housing should be. In the City of Birmingham, England—changing the figures over to dollars on the basis of $4 to the pound—housing units have been built costing $4,724 each, approximately the original estimate for Regent Park, which would have been the estimate yet if we had not abandoned price controls, which I will deal with later. The loan charges on that money amount to $157 a year, at 2⅝ per cent., and it is paid for over 60 years. Repairs and maintenance $33; management $6; and insurance $1.20; vacancies and losses $2.80; a total of $43.

Now we deduct the government subsidy of $66 and a local subsidy of $22, a total of $88. The net annual rental, therefore, is $112.

Those were annual figures. Monthly rental $9.33 and you add taxes and water rates $5.80, making a net monthly rental, for a three-roomed house, $15.13 a month. That is in Birmingham, England.

Now, let me give you figures for the United States of America. In the United States of America in—

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that where they had the coal in the bathtub?

MR. DENNISON: I can give you good examples from the United States of America. In Newark, New Jersey, monthly rental, for four people, $21 to $24. In Buffalo, New York—just across the river—monthly rental for three to four people, $23 to $33. In Boston, Massachusetts, the monthly rental runs from $21 to $27.

Now, I pick up the *Telegram* tonight and I find out the first man to move into Regent Park is a veteran with five children, who is now paying $19 a month. He is going to be moved into a $49 a month group-house, plus a service charge of $13, or a total of $62 a month, and on top of that he has to pay his gas rates—and his hydro rates. Mr. Speaker, that is not low-rental housing, and I say this government has a responsibility—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: —to rescue this scheme and make this scheme stand out as an example. It is not going to be an example of good housing unless you do so, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter). It is not going to be an example of low-cost housing.

The rents in Regent Park are estimated at 20 per cent. of the monthly earnings of the wage-earner, plus $10 for each member of the family drawing income. However, on top of that 20 per cent. is added this service charge, which, in almost every case makes the rental 25 per cent. of the man's earnings.

The workers in that area requested me to put this before the government: they believe that in computing those rentals they should not be charged with their entire pay, but they should be charged only with their "take-home" pay; just the pay they take home should be estimated, but at the present time, all their pay, including taxes and everything else, is estimated. They believe there should be a ceiling of $50 a month on these houses in Regent Park, and I would like to see the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) seriously undertake some responsibility in trying to place a ceiling on those rentals.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): How much do you think that would cost? Have you estimated that?

MR. DENNISON: The mayor tells me that the economic rental is $52 a month.

MR. FROST: But how much would it cost the province to subsidize the project to that extent?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Provincial Treasurer, I believe it might cost you considerable money.

MR. FROST: Yes, but how much for Regent Park?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How much? How much?

MR. DENNISON: It might cost you—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How much?

MR. DENNISON: It might cost $2,000 per unit to make this a genuine low-rental housing—

MR. PORTER: $2,000 a year?

MR. DENNISON: It might cost you $2,000 per unit.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is another $56,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many units are there in Toronto?

MR. DENNISON: They estimate 56 in this unit.

MR. F. S. THOMAS (PC Elgin): In Toronto, how many units?

MR. DENNISON: In the whole city of Toronto—

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member (Mr. Thomas, Elgin) who wishes to ask a question, please rise?

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, how many units would you desire in Toronto?

MR. DENNISON: We are only concerned in this case with Regent Park, and there are 950 units.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): How many in Toronto?

MR. DENNISON: That is a hypothetical question.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): No, it is not. It is practical.

MR. DENNISON: It is hypothetical.

AN HON. MEMBER: It does not mean a thing.

MR. DENNISON: I can see what the hon. member (Mr. Thomas, Elgin) is driving at. He is intimating the rest of the province has no responsibility to rescue this one scheme in Toronto; that if they pay a subsidy in Regent Park, why not pay a subsidy to all the houses in Toronto? Is that what the hon. member (Mr. Thomas, Elgin) means?

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, can I explain what I am trying to ask?

MR. DENNISON: Yes, what is the question?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) to this: we, on the farms in Ontario—and there are many of us—have a housing problem just the same as the City of Toronto.

MR. FROST: Hear, hear.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): And that housing problem is to provide my hired man with a free house. Now, do you expect me or any other farmer in Ontario to provide a man with a house, and then subsidize these urban centres to the tune you are asking, out of taxation, at the present prices for farm products?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, that is a fair question. I believe this government should be building 10,000 houses a year all through this province.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: In rural areas, as well as city areas. I believe the only way this government, or any government, can achieve genuine low-rental houses is to do it on a big scale and to keep prices down on your materials right from the forest and the brickyard to the house. You have got to go into this thing on a big scale, and the province should have undertaken this.

MR. FROST: Can I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) how much 10,000 houses would cost?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Not as much as your hydro extension.

MR. FROST: Never mind about our hydro extension.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, if the government of this province had carried it out, Point No. 8 in the famous "Twenty-Two Points" in which they said on the 3rd of July, 1943, they would provide security for people in this province from the cradle to the grave—

MR. PORTER: We did not say anything about "cradle to the grave."

MR. DENNISON: "Security from the cradle to the grave."

MR. PORTER: Was never mentioned.

MR. DENNISON: You never mentioned "cradle to the grave"?

MR. PORTER: You are mixing it up with the Beveridge Report now.

MR. DENNISON: This is a government publication. It has "Gorgeous George's" (Mr. Drew) picture on the front of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: That was printed by you people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh oh.

MR. DENNISON: This is printed by Might Directories Limited, published by the Progressive-Conservative Party of Ontario, and in case the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has forgotten his own programme, I want to read—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON:—a section from the preamble to the "Twenty-two Points."

AN HON. MEMBER: They are trying to forget it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You asked for it.

MR. DENNISON:

"In the statement of policy made by the Leader, Mr. George Drew, the Progressive-Conservative Party of Ontario proclaims its faith in the future."

MR. FROST: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON:

"The Party's firm belief is that the natural wealth and production capacity of the province are such as will provide steady employment at good wages—"

MR. FROST: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON:

"—for all industrious citizens together with economic and social security from the cradle to the grave."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON:

"All that is required to make that vision come true is a strong, forthright government in Queen's Park."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: That is what you got, and look at the progress we have made in the last five years.

MR. DENNISON: What a vision.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They will think twice about interrupting next time.

MR. FROST: Look at the great prosperity under this government.

MR. DENNISON: It may be that what they thought was a "vision" has now become a "mirage."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Let me read Point No. 8:

"To create an Ontario Housing Commission for the purpose of wiping out slums—"

MR. FROST: We have gone further than that. We have set up a department.

MR. DENNISON: The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) now says he does not want them wiped out.

MR. PORTER: I did not say anything of the kind.

MR. DENNISON:

"—for the purpose of wiping out slums, improving home conditions in city, town and country—"

There is something in here for the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas); they promised houses on your farm, too.

MR. FROST: That is what we are doing. That is how we came to put in lights for 60,000 rural people.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L. Brant): What about the Housing Commission? You promised that.

MR. FROST: I would say this, Mr. Speaker—

MR. DENNISON: I would like to see the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) read the "Twenty-Two Points."

MR. FROST: I would like to say this about housing—

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the fact we have a very small number here tonight, and that we are going to have, I hope, a very enjoyable time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: But at the same time, let us have one at a time. You know if you were sitting where I am and trying to hear about six or eight voices at once, and trying to determine who has the floor, I am sure you would sympathize with me.

I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) wants to ask a question. I do not know. The hon. member (Mr. Dennison) who has the floor, is trying to speak. Let us try to even this thing down. The hon. member (Mr. Dennison) has the floor right now. If he wishes to have a question asked, it is perfectly all right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. member who is making the speech should have at least as much time as the uneasy Ministers who are interrupting him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Frost) being just a little disturbed at having these "Twenty-two Points" resurrected.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. DENNISON: And read in this House. I am sure half the Tory members in this House have forgotten about the promises they made in 1943.

MR. FROST: You have not let us forget any of them.

MR. DENNISON: And for the benefit of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas), I want to say he promised you people on the farms houses too, because he said—

> "—improving home conditions in city, town and country and providing post-war employment on a large scale."

Mr. Speaker—

MR. PORTER: Can you get any carpenters today?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, post-war employment on a large scale, building houses on a large scale, you have to have plans for—

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I remind my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) of this—

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, may I just finish this? Before you have plans for houses, you have to believe in houses; you have to believe in public housing—

MR. FROST: Public houses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: You may not believe in public housing—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: We are not being criticized for that?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, this province was promised a Housing Commission, with plans ready, when the post-war period arrived, for housing and we find now an admission by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) that not only have they no plans of their own, but—

MR. PORTER: I said nothing of the kind.

MR. DENNISON: But they are not sure whether they are going to help anyone who has plans or not.

MR. PORTER: I said nothing of the kind. No admission of the kind did I make.

MR. DENNISON: You admitted you were only prepared to put up $56,000 for a housing project when you know you should pump in a $1,500,000—

MR. PORTER: You are talking about one little isolated detail.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal for a moment with price controls—

MR. PORTER: Oh, now I can relax.

MR. DENNISON: —in this province, and I do this because the hon. Provincial Treasurer assured us the other day of his sorrow at the tragic state of conditions in this province due to inflation. We all lament the fact—

MR. FROST: I did not say any such thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: I did not say any such thing. My friend (Mr. Dennison) has been having a bad dream.

MR. DENNISON: You are not happy about inflation, are you, Mr. Minister?

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you think it is a good thing?

MR. FROST: Did you read my speech? I did not say that.

MR. DENNISON: I am amazed if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is in favour of inflation.

MR. FROST: Why do you not read the speech?

MR. DENNISON: I took it from the speech, he was against inflation—

MR. FROST: He is just against sin.

MR. DENNISON: He is not against some of the results, I take it. I am against all the results of inflation, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to tell the House why. I think 75 per cent. of the people of this province are worse off today than they were two years ago because of inflation. Price controls, while they may have been burdensome at times, because of an expenditure of over $200,000,000 returned to the people of this country over $2,500,000,000 in benefits.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Did you mean wages, too?

MR. DENNISON: Price controls, while they have been criticized, have enabled us to win the war and do a great deal better job in this war than we did the first war when prices ran away up during the war.

MR. DALEY: Did you mean wage control too?

MR. DENNISON: I will deal with wage controls too, because I believe Labour in this House has been slandered by government ministers who insinuated that Labour was not in favour of keeping the lid on price ceilings. Labour fought to keep the lid on price ceilings, and I can well remember in 1946 that the two leading Labour bodies in this country went down to Ottawa and told the government: "We want to hold the lid on price ceilings. We are prepared, if you will keep the lid on other things, to make no further wage demands this year." That challenge was not taken up by the government.

Let me just quote from a little booklet which was put out by the Dominion of Canada at the time they floated the last Victory Loan.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. DENNISON: This booklet was put in the envelope of every one who purchased a war savings certificate in 1946, and I think, in simple language, it gives the strongest reasons for price control. First of all, it tells the people of Canada the amount of money we saved as a result of price control. It says:

> "This situation is not the result of sheer good luck by any means. It represents a vast amount of planning and direction by agencies of the government responsible for civilian supplies—a vast amount of planning and direction."

And at the end of this book we have another quotation and this is the pledge they gave the people of Canada who were investing their money in war savings certificates and government bonds at the time:

> "The Canadian Government must, if it is at all possible, return to its citizens dollars equal in purchasing power to those they are now saving or investing."

Finally, at the end of the book I want to quote this—

MR. FROST: Is this government to blame for that too?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the federal.

MR. DENNISON: Oh, no, I am not blaming you for that. But let me continue my argument, Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). If you feel guilty, I have no objection to you proclaiming your guilt, but if you do not feel guilty at the present time, you might wait till I continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON:

"We must not forget that our record is the result of unceasing vigilance, unrelenting effort and joint responsibility in a common cause; to slip up now, to relax, will not only mar that record, it will weaken our war effort at a moment of crisis in the battle for democracy, as well as accentuate post-war dislocation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, who were the forces asking for post-war dislocation? And post-war dislocation we have. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

MR. FROST: The CCF.

MR. DENNISON: It certainly was not the CCF, Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

AN HON. MEMBER: Who was it?

MR. DENNISON: 66 per cent. of the Canadian people favoured in 1946-47 a retention of price controls. Who blew the lid off? Where was the pressure coming from to lift the lid on price controls?

MR. FROST: Rt. Hon. Mackenzie King.

MR. DENNISON: And to destroy the savings of the Canadian people?

MR. FROST: Rt. Hon. Mackenzie King.

MR. DENNISON: The hon. Provincial Treasurer blames it on—

MR. FROST: And his first lieutenant, Mr. Coldwell. They work together, do they not?

MR. DENNISON: I will deal with Rt. Hon. Mackenzie King in a moment. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) may not agree with me.

MR. FROST: Do they not work together?

MR. DENNISON: The people of this country had $2,500,000,000 in the bank when the war ended. They had invested $3,250,000,000 of their money in war savings certificates and in government bonds, and when price controls were abandoned, those who advocated the abandonment of price controls, by that action, wiped out 40 per cent. of the savings of the people of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: How?

MR. DENNISON: That is the responsibility —if this government wants to assume credit for it—of those who advocated the abandonment of price controls. Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear an awful lot about those who would destroy your savings in the bank. We hear an awful lot of propaganda from propagandists against the CCF, that the CCF might in some mysterious way interfere with the savings of the people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the people who interfere most with the savings of the people of this country were those who blew the lid off the controls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: They were protecting the people of this country and protecting the savings of the people of this country. Jesse James may have got a name for robbing banks when he rode up on his old charger with two guns by his side, held up the bank and took the money away, but those people who abandoned price controls in this country robbed the savings of the people more effectively than 10,000 Jesse James'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whoa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who were they?

MR. FROST: Who did this?

MR. DENNISON: Yes, who were they? Let me quote from the official organ of the Conservative Party in this connection, 1946.

MR. FROST: Let me say this—

MR. DENNISON: The official organ of the Conservative Party, *Public Opinion,* published in March, 1946, which said:

> "We are opposed in principle to the continuation of every war-time wage and price ceiling and restrictive control."

AN HON. MEMBER: Answer that.

MR. DENNISON: And in the City of Toronto, the representative for my constituency in the Federal House, Mr. Harry Jackman, time after time, stood up in the House of Commons and outside of it, and demanded the removal of price controls. If Rt. Hon. Mackenzie King finally agreed to the removal of price controls—and Rt. Hon. Mackenzie King and the Liberal Party had a responsibility—they were pushed into it by the weight of pressure—

MR. FROST: Oh, oh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: —of the Tory guard. Who wanted to try to keep price controls? Mr. Hannam, of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, said in 1946 the Federation wanted a "stabilization programme which involved some controls." The United Farmers of Alberta very openly demanded the retention of price controls.

Who demanded that they be taken away? The Canadian Manufacturers' Association did not want them. Every Conservative newspaper in Canada demanded that price controls be lifted. The mining interests up in new Ontario not only demanded price controls be lifted, but they want to devaluate the Canadian dollar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: I am surprised some hon. members on the government side want to devaluate the Canadian dollar. Here is a dollar, Mr. Speaker—

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): Send it over.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where did you get it?

MR. DENNISON: When the dollar bill looks you in the face, the Tories at Ottawa want the dollar bill to say: "I am only worth 30 cents." It is only worth 40 cents now, but if you devalue the dollar, as Mr. Drew wants to do, it will only be worth 30 cents.

Mr. Speaker, we, on the CCF side of the House demand a dollar bill worth 100 cents on the dollar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, the argument on behalf of big business was they did not have enough profits. They wanted to abandon price controls so they would be able to survive.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pay more wages.

MR. DENNISON: They said they could not even survive. Let me give you one or two illustrations. Take the case of farm machinery. There was a vote taken on the subject of price controls and with respect of farm machinery, that is a very interesting vote. On April 13, 1946, in the House of Commons, the CCF had an amendment before the House demanding that the request of the Massey-Harris Company and others for an increase in farm machinery be defeated.

The House voted on the CCF amendment this way: 63 Liberals voted for higher prices of farm machinery and 64 were not in their seats; 23 Conservatives voted for higher prices on farm machinery and 43 were not in their seats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: Of the CCF 23 voted against an increase in farm machinery prices, and only 5 CCF members were absent, so the CCF were in there battling for the farmers of this country.

MR. F. S. THOMAS (PC Elgin): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): Would you mind telling me of the cost of farm machinery, how much of the cost is labour?

MR. DENNISON: I believe the 1938 investigation by the Canadian House of Commons, disclosed that 17 per cent. of the cost of farm machinery is labour—only 17 per cent.

Dealing with labour, let me just give you the rest of the picture on labour. It was not labour in 1946 that forced the increase in cost of farm machinery. In 1946, the average wage in Canada only went up from $32.13 to $33.23, an increase of 4 per cent. Wages only increased 4 per cent. in the industries of Canada in 1946. The profits of 28 of our largest manufacturers and corporations in this country increased from $33,000,000 to $52,000,000, an increase of 56 per cent, in 1946.

Here are the profits by the Massey-Harris Company, after taxes. The profits in 1945 were $1,588,000; in 1946 they jumped to $2,125,000, and in 1947 they jumped to $4,084,000, and the other day they were announced as $9,000,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) is sincerely interested in the welfare of agriculture, and I know, too, that he is in the wrong party if he wants to fight for agriculture.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): No, sir.

MR. DENNISON: The farmers stand to lose more than anybody else by putting grain back on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. What happened in the case of rye last year? Last year, 7,000,000 bushels of rye went through the exchange, and the price of No. 1 C.W. six-row rye in Winnipeg was $4.47 in July. On September 7th it had dropped to $1.37, a drop of $3.10 a bushel. The farmers stand to lose, if we go back to the speculating grain market on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. That is why the western farmers, who have had to put up with a lot of restrictions during the wartime, do not want to go back to that grain exchange. They do not want people gambling with their raw materials, and their produce.

Now, let us consider petroleum. On February 6th, 1946, the Federal Government allowed the poor petroleum industry to have an increase in the price of oils. What was the result? At the end of that year, the Imperial Oil Company alone declared a profit after paying taxes of $16,000,000. And that was the year they were begging for an increase in prices. They said they could not live if they did not have increased prices.

The same is true of cotton goods.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L, Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) a question. Upon what investment of capital was that $16,000,000 profit derived from?

MR. DENNISON: I am sorry I cannot give you that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: I just give that figure "$16,000,000" to prove that a company with $16,000,000 profit is not too close to the wall.

MR. FROST: Anything that will distort the picture.

MR. DENNISON: Let us consider the Steel Company. In 1946, the Steel Company of Canada went to Ottawa with a poor cry, "We cannot keep our factories going; we cannot pay these wages; we have to have an increase in the price of steel," and they were granted $5 a ton increase in steel, before they granted any wage increases at all. There were no wage increases when the $5 a ton went on. And yet the Steel Company of Canada made a net profit that year, after paying taxes, of $4,000,000, and this is the company who said in the investigation at Ottawa, the following year, "We have had to contribute generously to the campaign funds of political parties," and the CCF announced at that time that it had not received any of these campaign funds.

MR. FROST: We did not get any, either.

MR. DENNISON: I do not believe the Steel Company would finance the Labour-Progressive Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: You never can tell.

MR. DENNISON: I think Mr. Hilton said "Both of the old parties."

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is right; I heard him say it.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I am going to wind up my speech by saying that this country has suffered a great deal from the lifting of price controls, and no one has suffered more than the old people of this country, the people who are on fixed salaries, and the people who are on pensions. I have received at least 25 letters from teachers on pension in my riding, and in every case they tell me "We paid good 100-cents dollars in money into our pension fund, and we are being paid out of that pension fund with depreciated currency." Call it Confederate money, if you want to. There was a time in the United States when if you wanted to speak of money as being of no value, you referred to the money printed by the south during the Civil War. That is the money we have in this country, thanks to those who lifted the price ceilings, and that burden falls the heaviest upon the retired farmers, and the retired teachers, and the old-age pensioners. The old-age pensioners, getting $30 a month in 1945 and 1946 are, in reality, only getting $18 a month today. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) the other day recognized this need by increasing the exemption for widows from succession duties, from $25,000 up to $50,000, because he said, in answer to my question, that the dollar was not worth as much as it was a few years ago. I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to follow that same rule in dealing with the old-age pensioners.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: A dollar bill is not worth a dollar today. You would have to be paying $42 or $43, to give these old-age pensioners a value up to $30.

MR. FROST: We recognized that, and we recognize also there are a lot of difficulties. When we came into office six years ago, the old-age pension was $20—

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, $28.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, $28; you are wrong.

MR. FROST: No, it is you who are wrong. The $5 increase came after we came into office. What happened was that under the administration of my friends opposite, the old-age pensioners were getting $20, and as sort of a death-bed offering, they added on 15 per cent. in 1943, but it did not take effect until this government came into office. Since that time, the basic fund has been raised up to $30, with an additional $10 on the basis of need, which raises it to $40.

We recognize that is not all that is to be desired, but nevertheless, it is going up.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But it is not $40.

MR. FROST: In some cases.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Very few cases.

AN HON. MEMBER: Over 5,000.

MR. SALSBERG: How do you know?

MR. PORTER: We will tell you all about that, a little later on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. L. HALL (PC Halton): Mr. Speaker, before speaking on the budget debate, I would like to pay my humble respects to the late Walter B. Reynolds. He shall always be remembered by me as a Christian gentleman.

In rising to speak on the budget debate, I do so with considerable pride for I believe that the present budget is

one of the best budgets that has been presented to this Assembly and to the people of the Province of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I believe in statements founded on facts. I shall endeavour to give this Assembly facts.

This budget and all the budgets that have been presented in this Assembly since the Conservative administration took office after the 1943 election are the statements of facts on promises that the Hon. George Drew gave the people of Ontario during that election.

When some of those undertakings were being put on the Statute books of this province, the opposition said that it was impossible—that the government could not carry out their promises. Mr. Speaker, we have carried out our promise and in a great many undertakings we have enlarged them.

It is impossible for me to go into detail on all those undertakings, much as I would like to do so. But this is a free country, a country of free speech and if I were to explain all the benefits that the Province of Ontario has received from the good administration of the Conservative Government since the 1943 election, there would not be time for any other hon. member to speak on this, the greatest budget ever presented to the people of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HALL: I would like to remind this Assembly and the people of Ontario that education has benefited more under the Conservative administration since 1943 than it ever did under all the previous administrations since Confederation, an accomplishment that the opposition said was impossible. Yet, this was accomplished without any additional taxation.

This is a long-range budget laying the foundations for the future and that has been the underlying principle of all budgets of this Conservative administration.

In the present budget there are no new taxations, instead there are reductions in some fields—the Athletic Control Act, the Corporations Tax Act and the Succession Duties Act.

The aim of the Conservative Administration is good administration and less taxation.

The present administration is the first to grant 50 per cent. of the cost to the municipalities to build homes for the aged.

McMaster University, for the first time in its history to receive grants, will receive a capital grant of $250,000 and a maintenance grant of $100,000. Succession duties are reduced to relieve widows and dependents; larger grants for Children's Aid work; more relief to superannuated school teachers.

In 1949 the schools of Ontario will receive approximately $37,000,000 in grants.

All these accomplishments are the fruits of honest, sane administration.

Over 5,000 families enabled to purchase homes; municipalities assisted in 2,915 more houses; 31,100 housing units completed in the province.

There are $1,200,000 provided in estimates to assist municipalities in servicing houses to be built; Hydro-Electric Power Commission to spend $120,000,000 this year in its construction programme; rural power lines are to be increased by 3,889 miles in 1949, adding 40,000 new customers.

Five years of administration showing a surplus each year without increased taxation, yet in many services contributing larger grants, is a record which has not been achieved by any former administration in the Province of Ontario.

The great migration of people to the Province of Ontario, the great expansion of industry in the province, and the prospects of still greater expansion in the future, are all the fruits of good administration. For those things do not happen when there is poor administration of public affairs.

The great development that has taken place in the Province of Ontario during the last five years has been the honest effort of a man under whose leadership

greater things have been accomplished in shorter time than were ever accomplished in the history of the Province of Ontario. Mr. Speaker: These things were accomplished against greater odds than any leader of previous administrations in the Province of Ontario ever had to contend with. I refer to Colonel the Hon. George Drew.

It is rather amusing to hear the opposition say that the Conservative platform of the 1943 election is as good as new for it has never been used.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HALL: I am sorry the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has left the Chamber, as there was something I wanted to say to him.

There was never a more irresponsible statement made.

During the session of 1944 every item in that policy was dealt with, some to greater degrees than others.

The reason for the irresponsible statement, which I just mentioned, is that during the 1944 session the Drew administration was outnumbered by the opposition by several seats, yet the Leader of the Opposition never opposed the administration in the implementation of that policy.

The Leader of the Opposition knew that it was the greatest policy ever presented to the people of Ontario.

I must congratulate the hon. member for his good judgment.

People do not go to a new land without first knowing the conditions under which they must live. They certainly want to know what form of government they must live under, what opportunities there are for the future.

People are coming to Ontario for they know that in Ontario there is a government that believes in British justice, where the right of every citizen is protected and where he may follow the vocation of his choice.

I would like to reply to the statement of an hon. member in this debate that was to the effect that children are not responsible to their parents. Those of us who were brought up under Christian teachings resent such a statement.

I would answer that statement by quoting from Scripture, if I may, one of the great commandments, "Honour thy Father and thy Mother that thy days may be long in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee."

In closing my remarks, may I say, we have a great country with great opportunities and that we as citizens have a great responsibility, and that when history is written may it be that we did not destroy our country, that we did make use of our opportunities and that we as citizens accepted our responsibilities.

I thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. F. K. FELL (CCF Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the Budget debate, I wish, first of all to express my condolence to the family of the late hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds). Though I have not had the pleasure of sitting with Mr. Reynolds in this House before this session, I was deeply impressed with his obvious sincerity and the respect which was paid to him from all sections of the House.

I do wish to join with the other hon. members who have paid tribute to such a splendid man.

Since I have already spoken in the debate on the address of the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to weary the hon. members with a long speech tonight. However, I do feel that there are one or two outstanding questions which have been brought forward in the press during the past few days, of which some mention should be made at this time.

My first reference, Mr. Speaker, is to an article which was published in the Toronto *Telegram* on Saturday, March 12th, of this year, entitled "Cheerful interior belies gloomy-looking 999 Queen Street." I imagine most of the hon. members have read this article—at least, I hope they have. I do not want

to say that the article is completely untrue, but I must say that there is a strong difference of opinion between myself and the correspondent who composed this article for the *Telegram*. I think I can speak with some authority, Mr. Speaker, on this subject, because it is only a matter of something like two weeks since I made a very intensive and extensive tour of 999 Queen Street West, myself.

Now, referring to the article; first I must disagree entirely with the first wording in the heading of the article, namely, the word "cheerful." The only feeling of cheerfulness I had in coming away from that visit, was the fact that I was able to come away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER: You were lucky.

MR. FELL: The article says, in effect, that the interior of the hospital is cheerful. I am bound to say, on the basis of what I have seen myself, that I did not find it so, nor has anyone to whom I have spoken, who has ever visited the hospital. The only word which seems to be most descriptive is the one word "depressing."

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that much effort is being put forward in an attempt to brighten up the building and the rooms, and the general surroundings, but it seems to me it is a hopeless task. The correspondent makes reference to the bright, clean, airy condition of the wards. This, too, I did not find to be entirely true, Mr. Speaker. I certainly found that everything was very clean, but it was not bright, nor was it attractive. The long, high-ceilinged corridors were very inadequately lighted either by sunlight or artificial light. This is a condition which can only be rectified by somehow allowing more light to come into the building. No amount of paint will make up for the lack of light. In a moment I will say what I think might be done to improve this and other conditions.

I noticed that the article was accompanied by pictures, which certainly gave the impression that some of the rooms were both adequate and pleasant. I would like to draw your attention to the picture describing what was called the "patients' dining room." I do not suppose many of the hon. members still have this copy of the *Telegram* in their desks, but if you will recall, there was a picture of what purported to be a patients' dining room, complete with flowers on the tables, and drapes on the windows, and so on, it all gave the impression of a most cheerful room. In fact, I would say that the room shown in that picture was cheerful. But I must say that on my visit through the hospital, the only dining room which was shown to me, and which looked like that picture, was the staff dining room, certainly not the patients'. I do not want to suggest the *Telegram* was being deliberately dishonest, but perhaps the photographer got his captions mixed.

I remember very clearly the feeling of revulsion — and I use the word "revulsion" advisedly — when passing through what was described to me as the male patients' dining room. The room was drab and dreary, and certainly not the sort of a room which you or I, even in good health, would care to eat a meal in. The eating utensils were worse than anything I ever saw in the army. They were in very bad condition. Certainly, in the service, if we had been found to have been equipped with such utensils, I am sure our medical officer would have condemned them, and ordered us to draw new utensils from the quartermasters stores.

I must say the meals seemed quite adequate. In fact, the kitchen seemed to me to be the only department which had adequate space and equipment, and I suggest that was the most contributing factor to the fact that the patients did receive good meals.

From the moment you enter the hospital, and see the way the patients are crowded in, you get the impression there must be a severe lack of trained personnel. This impression was confirmed when I discovered that certain

patients who might need special treatments, such as shock treatment, or fever treatment, were not able to get such treatment at the time they should have had them, because the staff were too busy with other patients. For example, both shock and fever treatments require the assistance, I understand, of all the available staff. That is to say, the problem here is that where a patient required shock treatment, another patient would be requiring another form of treatment at the same time, and it was physically impossible for the staff of the hospital to conduct both types of treatment at the same time, in spite of the fact that, according to the material available for these treatments, it should have been possible, but it was impossible because of the fact that there was a severe lack of adequate personnel. The result was, Mr. Speaker, that the staff have to choose which patient is to receive his treatment and which is not, and I suggest that is not a condition which should exist in any hospital.

During my visit, I saw a large number of patients wandering aimlessly up and down the dark and dreary corridors. I say "dark and dreary" advisedly, regardless of what the underdeveloped pictures in the *Telegram* may indicate. I did see many patients wandering up and down the corridors aimlessly. I will not give you a description of the patients themselves, but they were certainly sights to see. In some cases, this may not be detrimental to a patient's condition, but I do not think anybody could say it would be helpful.

There were almost no facilities for recreation, and I say that despite what the correspondent had said in his article. There were, as far as I could find out, very few facilities for recreation. As a matter of fact, when I questioned some of the staff as to what recreation was available, it was pointed out, that particularly at this time of the year, recreation was limited. There are conducted walks about the grounds and buildings, and for those patients who cannot be accommodated, in a supervised capacity outside of the grounds, they were simply allowed to walk up and down locked corridors, as I have referred to a moment ago.

The *Telegram* correspondent referred to his impression of the aged and infirm patients, as patients who were "waiting for death." In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement. My feelings were very much the same as his appeared to be, upon entering the ward, where so many were actually packed in the wards. I witnessed, Mr. Speaker, instances in some wards where it was necessary for a patient to climb over three or four beds to get to his own, they were that close together. It may be that in this day of modern science we have somehow managed to extend the life expectancy of the human body without extending the life expectancy of the human mind correspondingly. However, I must condemn, wholeheartedly, this correspondent's statement, and I quote, "pneumonia, the old people's friend, has been thwarted by penicillin." Does the correspondent mean to infer that the aged and infirm should simply be allowed to die of pneumonia? Is this his solution to the over-crowding problem? This is the most calloused, the most unchristian statement that I have ever heard. I can only hope this is not the impression the correspondent intended to leave.

One more word on this point, Mr. Speaker, I have also visited, in the accompaniment of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) at one of the more modern hospitals, at New Toronto, and after visiting that hospital I came away with an entirely different point of view than I came away with after visiting the hospital at 999 Queen West—entirely different.

If the word "cheerful" could be used in describing some of our mental hospitals, certainly it came closer to being the word to describe the hospital at New Toronto than the hospital at 999 Queen West. You could see there was a real effort and possibility of creating an atmosphere beneficial to patients who were undergoing treatment and certainly gave every one, including the staff, the impression they were working towards something, not just going around in the

dark corridors as though hidden away in the middle ages.

If the *Telegram* merely wanted to show a fairly modern hospital, they might much better have sent their correspondent out to New Toronto, rather than taking him to 999 Queen St. West and try to picture a dark horse as being fairly white or grey.

This is a situation, Mr. Speaker, which the government members themselves have admitted is deplorable and they themselves have, in their own words many times, condemned or disagreed with many of the things which have been said in this article.

I promised to say something about my impression of the solution to this problem, that is the problem of overcrowding. I think the answer is quite obvious; we have to somehow or another build more hospitals. I know the question has been mentioned many times during this session; I know the hon. Minister of Health, Mr. Kelley, and his department, are attempting to build more hospitals, but I say this problem is getting greater and greater and more severe every day and it is something which has only been receiving partial attention from this government and many other governments. And if we are to decrease these problems rather than allow them to grow, then we have to tackle them at the real source.

On that point, I would like to enlarge by saying not only have we got to build more hospitals, not only have we got to take a more stringent attitude towards this problem, we have to realize the things we are discussing now as solutions are only temporary. We have to go deeper than that. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Hall) said he was reminded of a piece of Scripture—if he does not object, I would like to repeat what he said—it was to this effect, "Honour thy father and thy mother that their days may be full on this earth." Words to that effect. I know it better, I assure you; my mother is in the gallery and she can vouch for that, but, Mr. Speaker, I think we have hit something there in connection with this particular problem; as Christians we believe it is our duty to honour our mothers and fathers and I think not only our mothers and fathers but our grandmothers and grandfathers, our great-grandmothers and great-grandfathers and somebody else's mother and father.

The situation we find so many of our people in today is because we have for many years past neglected to assume that responsibility which we claim is our duty as Christians. We are not looking after our mothers and fathers. We are not making adequate provision for their old age, and here is the proof, it has rolled up on us and now is on our door step. For many years this has been accumulating and here it is. I have seen mothers and fathers, grandmothers and grandfathers, sitting around in the corridors of 999 Queen West waiting to die, nobody wants them. In most cases it is not a case of their people not wanting them, but they cannot have them like this. They should be at home and they should not be in this condition, and if we do not take adequate precaution, and if our medical scientists had been aware and the government cooperating with the scientists who warned that this was coming, and if we had taken the necessary action then to treat mental patients when they were 20 and 30 years old, they would not be in 999 Queen West today at 65 and 70 years of age.

I know that this problem cannot be remedied over night. I know it is going to be a long-range proposition, but I think this should warn us of what is going to face us in another ten or fifteen years because every day science is extending further the life expectancy of the human body, but the extent of the expectancy to our human brain is not going ahead much further. That means, I suggest, this problem is going to become greater in the future.

As I said previously, the problem in the case of overcrowding is not only building more hospitals but treating this type of patient. There is another problem, but one which we can do something about immediately and that

is the problem of staff, adequate staff. The problem of shortage of staff is perhaps difficult but is worth doing something about immediately, certainly one reason for it is that the men and women with good qualifications are not encouraged to accept jobs in mental hospitals by a reasonable wage standard, or reasonable wage levels. I am not positive of my figures, but I talked to many employees of the mental hospitals and I find some are working for $18, $25 and $28 a week, married people in some cases. I am not sure, but I think these figures are correct. I think, Mr. Speaker, taking a quick look at the figures, the average wage, I would suggest, for employees in mental hospitals is something like $23, to $25 a week. I ask you, is that the kind of wages which is going to attract people to hospitals, which doctors tell us are necessary to make hospitals, and in spite of the very inadequate facilities do for the job that they are intended to do.

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Would that include keep, maintenance and shelter for these people, or is that take-home pay?

MR. FELL: Yes, I think it does.

HON. MR. DALEY: Maintenance would be in addition to that.

MR. FELL: I stand for correction, but at the moment the figures I have, I suggest they do include maintenance, just two meals.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we can do something to alleviate the labour problem in hospitals; I would recommend most emphatically to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley)—it is unfortunate he is not here, but I imagine he will read *Hansard* tomorrow—that as soon as possible he establish a programme of education for people, not just psychiatrists, but those who would become attendants and that is where the greatest amount of work lies, in the work that the attendants do. It is in this case, in the treatment of patients, Mr. Speaker, more necessary that there be a great number of perfectly qualified attendants to assist a doctor. It is not the kind of treatment where you take a patient and put him in bed and there he stays with frequent or infrequent visits from nurses or doctors. In this particular case, attendants are necessary, a great number of them, because these people at times move in many directions and they are incapable, in the majority of cases, of even making their own direction; they have to be led. The average laymen could not do that kind of a job without training. It requires great patience and understanding of what you are trying to do with these people. I recommend very sincerely to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) that he inaugurate a programme attracting people to come and take these jobs in these particular hospitals. Of course, if he wants to attract the right men and women and encourage them to undertake a course of training, he must be prepared to raise to a reasonable level the wages now being paid attendants, whose responsibilities are so great and whose reward so little.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, it is great encouragement to me, I assure you, to have heard the thunderous applause that greeted my rising to participate in this debate.

I really do not intend to ask for it, Mr. Speaker, but, in the absence of 50 per cent. of the members of my group in the House, I was afraid I would get up and there would not even be a whisper. However, there is a sign that our voices are not voices in the wilderness, and we are evidently making inroads, are we not?

Now, having said that, I want to state, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely stimulating to rise at this hour and to join in the debate. It reminds me, almost, of a cartoon I saw of the American Senate in session. One man standing in front of his desk—a senator, evidently, or a stand-in, I don't know—raving and ranting and only two lone souls in that vast chamber in the rear, and one bends over to the other and says: "I will listen to you, if you will

listen to me." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are almost at that stage at this hour, and, if it keeps up I will suggest —and I know it will be greeted by some members—I will suggest that I surrender my privilege in order to defeat the government on a motion because we can outvote them very easily tonight.

HON. MR. FROST (PC Treasurer): Would you like to have an election?

MR. SALSBERG: My reply to the spokesman for the government is that I, for one, welcome an election anytime. The more often, the merrier. We like—

MR. FROST: Now, be careful, we are going to beat you next time.

MR. SALSBERG: I am always careful. I never trust you.

Now, Budget debates, Mr. Speaker, are a somewhat painful experience to me, because I am obliged ever since I am in this House to begin with an apology to the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost)—whom I like, and admire as a person, and who is undoubtedly the most genial, pleasant and smilingest of all the Cabinet members. Once I acknowledge that I find it extremely difficulty to go over to the offensive, and yet to the offensive I must go, because he is a Tory and he does deliver Tory budgets and what can you do? It is one of the unpleasant tasks you have to perform, and I want to say to the hon. members of the House, who, perhaps, are new here, that they should not become alarmed when a member of the opposition attacks their government. I notice an occasional outburst from the benches opposite me, an indication of pain that one Minister or another was sharply attacked. I have heard from more than one new member, "My, my, things are getting rough," and I assure them they just have not seen anything yet. After all this is not rough at all. This is just a pleasant relationship. They should have been here, I tell them, when the Tories were in opposition and when the genial, smiling and friendly Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was on the opposition benches. They tell me he made the life of the Liberals very very unhappy.

MR. NIXON: Oh, I would not say that.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not expect you to admit that. And so did all the others in the front benches, and if you become very sensitive, hon. members who are here for the first time, just think of what your brethren are doing, in Ottawa. Why, they are almost wild, according to the newspapers, in their behaviour. May I also remind you all, by way of defense of course—you notice I am defending myself in advance in the hope of staving off an attack from you —and may I therefore remind you that the Conservatives have a long tradition of engaging in rough stuff. Why, a hundred years ago you did that, and I want to read to you for a moment only, from an item that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on February 22, 1949, recently. I will, for the sake of dramatic effect, leave out a couple of words—I will put them in later. Here, in the *Globe and Mail* of February 22, 1949, I quote:

> "A public meeting to discuss the payment of the losses was called according to requisition, by the Mayor, for yesterday at 3 o'clock, in the old City Hall . . ."

That is, Toronto—

> "The room was full at the hour appointed, with the multitude of the most ignorant and violent of our population, which the Tories of Toronto have always had there on hand for any bad purpose."

Now, that is your background, and it is in the *Globe and Mail*. The only thing I should add now is that this is a reprint from the *Globe* of 100 years ago, which the *Globe and Mail* saw fit to reprint. Now, with that in your mind, I hope you will take the remark of the opposition not unkindly, and wit out any sign of unfriendliness. After all, I am alone tonight.

Now, the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is fond of using biblical quotations,

scriptures. He scatters them through his Budget you know. He flavours his Budget speeches with a quotation here, a bit of scripture there, and another bit as decoration, and I like his quotations. I think he picks well from the Bible. He does not pick so well for the budget recommendations, and I reminded him last year—and I do wish to remind him again—that in 1946, when he said the following—and they are pearls of wisdom—:

> "Don't think merely in terms of money values; not in columns of figures and decimals and statistics, but in terms of human values, of people."

Now, that is the way I think a budget should be approached but that is not the way it is approached by a Tory Government, even if it has a genial Treasurer, as it has at present. If hon. members will recall how many times they were asked, "How much money will it cost?" they will realize how this question does not correspond with the actual re-action of the Conservative Party toward human values. An hon. member spoke about education and the question was, "How much will it cost, have you figured it out?" Well, what about human values, people? Another hon. member asked that No. 999 Queen Street be improved and he is asked, "How much money will it cost, have you figured it out?" What about human values? I am therefore, obliged to say there is terrific gap between these nice statements and the deeds as expressed in the budget.

It is true that if promises could get people shelter and keep them warm, there would be no housing problem today. If promises could take care of the sick and their dependents, there would be no problem of hospitalization and health insurance but, alas, that is not so. Promises do not house people and do not feed them. What have the people left after all the pledges are broken? Let me remind you of a few—I could, as could any hon. member here, stand here and speak for hours and cite, not only 22 points. What about the countless other promises and pledges? Let me cite a couple, just a couple. This evening, during an interchange between the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) and the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) on housing, the hon. Minister said he never promised to build houses, just like that. Well, Mr. Speaker, all that is really necessary is for the Conservative Party to engage a battery of heralds to go up and down the province and tell the people not to worry about housing or slums because it is almost over. Just another four or five years and there will not be a slum left, not even for a museum, because here, to remind the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), he was then the hon. Minister of Planning, and, if you please, and I beg your pardon, Development, too, but mainly planning. The developing end was not touched yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Here is a clipping from the *Globe and Mail*, a very reliable newspaper, at least reliable to the government's point of view. It is a clipping from April 19, 1945, and the smiling face of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is on it. Here is the heading: "Wipe out slums within ten years, Porter pledges." Well, this is 1949, how many more years until there will be no slums? He never denied making the statement because he said it is one of those promises.

MR. W. MURDOCH (PC Essex South): Just a speech!

MR. SALSBERG: That is what your promises are, just speeches. I am glad you acknowledge that. It was just a speech to mislead the people, nothing was done to clear the slums. The slum situation is worse now than it ever was, despite this pious promise and the smiling face of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to seal it. The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) himself said it.

That is not all. In 1943, a promise was made which came to my mind the last couple of days when we were talking about hospitalization. This is from a speech delivered on November 11, 1943. The heading is, "Ontario plans to aid kin of tuberculosis patients."

Without burdening the House with long quotations from it, it is from the *Star,* the hon. Minister of Health and Welfare said: "We must remove financial fear both to encourage sick people to apply for treatment and so their speedy recovery is not hindered by worry over those who are dependent on them." That was said by Dr. Vivian in 1943. The problem is as grave now as it ever was but to the credit of Dr. Vivian, he cleared out of the government and quit. The other gentleman, however, got himself lifted up because he has half cleared the slums, evidently. That could be continued for a long time you know.

I gave two outstanding examples of promises and the results and I must say it is the same of the present Budget too. This Budget does not offer any basic solution to the main problems facing the people. Furthermore, I want to say that this is the first Budget since 1944, which, in my opinion, is approved by no one. I am sorry to say that, particularly at such a crucial time in the party when the question of leadership is in the balance. I do not mean to imply that the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is "slipping." After all, he is a candidate for leadership and far be it from me to say anything against him.

MR. FROST: Who said I was?

MR. SALSBERG: I do not mean he, as an individual, is "slipping," but his government is in terrible shape. I have a feeling in observing the government and its back-benchers, that it is like a rattling jitney before it began climbing the hills. This is the first session of the new parliament and it rattles all over.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you think our observation is from here?

MR. SALSBERG: Let me know when you are on your feet. Make a note so you will not forget it, do not rely on your memory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: That is the feeling I have and I am sure it is the feeling of the people.

Perhaps, hon. members would like to have proof? Well, you actually have a revolt against the government at the moment. The municipalities are up in arms. You were obliged to hold back two major bills and half of the hon. members of the cabinet left in town were meeting mayors of 40 municipalities, trying to appease them. Would you not call that a revolt? It is a minor revolt against this government, which in its first initial stage is already rattling. The teachers are unhappy, the cities are unhappy and the farmers are unhappy.

MR. FROST: Are you unhappy too?

MR. SALSBERG: I am happy to bring this to the attention of the government in the hope that unhappiness will be abolished.

MR. FROST: Oh, happy day.

MR. SALSBERG: Why, even the newspapers which support this government are unhappy. I have never seen a budget brought down in this House by the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) in the past, that should meet with so much criticism. Here is an item dated March 5th, from your favourite supporter, *The Globe and Mail*—"Not wholly satisfying." Coming from *The Globe and Mail* is a sign that it is pretty rotten.

Now, there is another paper that you are stirring up, the *Telegram* of March 9, I am not sure who it wants to offend—after all it has a new make-up and so on—but it says, "Grants may infringe local autonomy." That is adding to the spirit of revolt.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just stirring up trouble.

MR. SALSBERG: That is right and that is coming from your best papers and the leaders of your municipal revolt are good Conservatives but they cannot take this and they are up in arms. I noticed the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) tried to dazzle us with large figures. I am surprised that he did that, he knows better, he has a better technique. I really have a genuine respect for the

hon. Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) ability in the circumstances he happens to be in. I understand in his younger days he did not want to be a Tory but he could not help it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: He was meant to be a Liberal but they needed a new partner in the firm so he became a Conservative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: So, he gives us figures to represent the mileage of our roads and the mileage of our electric cables. I was saying to an hon. member that the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) might have asked me for some assistance if he was really so badly off. I would have suggested that he give us figures on the mileage of river beds in the Province of Ontario, and the mileage covered by the fish swimming in the rivers and lakes. He would really have had astronomical figures, colossal super-colossal figures to present.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: That does not provide for housing nor does it provide for the aged, nor does it do a lot of other things. What is the truth about the budget as I see it and other hon. members might see it differently, perhaps, and some hon. members opposite see it the same way I do, but there is such a thing as party loyalty and you bang the desks — not with the usual vigour—but you have to do it. From this point of view this budget is a misleading budget. That is number 1, it conceals tremendous surpluses from the citizens. I think this government is guilty of the same crime it charges Ottawa with, over-taxing the people. Second, I think this government is also guilty of the same crime it charges Ottawa with in regard to the usurpation of taxing power of other governments.

What is this government doing? It is usurping taxing powers of municipalities, ostensibly borrowed from them.

MR. FROST: Where?

MR. SALSBERG: You borrowed the income tax from the municipalities, in return for a one-mill subsidy. Now you get out from under it and you withdraw the subsidy—eliminated, finished.

MR. FROST: And pay them twice as much.

MR. SALSBERG: You promised them other things.

MR. FROST: We pay them twice as much.

MR. SALSBERG: Ottawa could tell you that too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: But you say Ottawa is trying to take taxing powers from you. I charge you with being guilty of the same crime, and your budget shows it.

MR. FROST: It does not.

MR. SALSBERG: You borrowed from the cities.

MR. FROST: No, no. My friends opposite did that. I am just paying them twice as much.

MR. SALSBERG: So you are guilty of that.

AN HON. MEMBER: An admission.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not defending the middle group. The third point, this government—the Tories rather—charges the Dominion Government with attempting to take away jurisdiction of the provinces through its proposals in the Dominion-Provincial Conferences, that they were going to establish too much centralized government. What are you doing? This budget shows you are equally as guilty as they are, only in your own field. This budget and the legislation which is brought in to the House to implement it is nothing but an indication of an alarming drive in the direction of curtailing the rights of municipal government in this province.

That is what you are doing.

Of course, the proper thing for this government, with its enormous surplus that it found difficult to hide and conceal, would have been to allow the mill subsidy to stand as was originally agreed, and practise what you preach; and then in addition, assume responsibility for social services.

MR. FROST: Well, the municipalities did not want it. They have all petitioned us to do away with the one-mill subsidy.

MR. SALSBERG: They want two mills.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: Social services such as hospital construction, such as costs for indigent patients, for unemployment relief. That would have been a constructive way of handling the situation, helping the municipalities and not depriving them of their rights, but instead, this government, in addition to increasing its control to municipal government or attempting to do that, is actually "flim-flamming" such cities as Toronto. I hope this is parliamentary, Mr. Speaker. I was not certain, but I think "flim-flamming" suits the need. If it should not be parliamentary, I will withdraw it, subject to your suggestion, sir, for a proper word.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: What does it do? What does the budget do to municipalities such as Toronto? It cuts off the assessment figure as a basis for estimating grants, because Toronto is re-assessing. Sure.

MR. FROST: Why, we never thought of such a thing.

MR. SALSBERG: May I at this stage say, since the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) never thought of it, that the Tory group in the Toronto city hall, on the eve of the election did boast how much extra revenue they were going to get from this province because of the increased assessment.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (CCF Ontario): Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: And nobody got up at Queen's Park to say: "No, that will never happen." You just let them create the illusion; you are just sitting back to watch the boys do their stuff downtown. Now, after their election, you come back and say: "That is no basis for estimating any more, no, we will give you gifts."

What the hon. Provincial Treasurer is actually doing is taking a dollar bill, which cannot be heard when you shake it in a box, change it into dimes, and now he can shake the box and instead of handing over a dollar, he throws out a dime here, a dime in another place, and another dime in a third place, and now he will have a dime left instead of having given a whole dollar as he used to do to the municipality.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: He is the "Great Giver." He rattles the box and he gives —dimes, please.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They make more noise.

MR. SALSBERG: Of course, they make more noise, that is why he changed the bill. What else did he do—what other "flim-flamming"—to municipalities such as Toronto? They reduced the educational grants. The hon. Minister of Education was on his feet when I made that remark some time earlier during the Session, but the fact is, you cut the educational grants to Toronto this year, and good Tories on the Board of Education were obliged to get up and acknowledge and say that Toronto is getting less than it got. And yet, every hon. member of this government has the gall to get up and say to the people of Toronto: "We are paying 50 per cent. of the cost of education." Speaking as a member for Toronto, I say: "That is not true. It is a lie." You are not paying 50 per cent. to Toronto. You are not increasing it, you are cutting it.

I know the government has given up hope of ever gaining constituencies in Toronto, and the hon. Minister of Education, who spoke tonight about building city housing with "poor farmers' money" is evidently looking for a constituency in the back concessions. He is ready to follow the leader. Is that not right?

Well, I know you have given up hope of gaining seats in the larger areas, but let us give truthful statements. You are cutting from the municipality insofar as education is concerned. Furthermore, you are paving the way for further reductions in the receipts of the cities like Toronto from the province in the future. Today there are heavy capital expenditures in the building of roads and some other things which the municipality has undertaken. Within a year or two they will taper off and so will the contributions and you will give the city less than you ever gave them under the mill grant. That even holds true for hospital construction.

Another point I want to make on the budget and its general ramification is this, that the budget reveals the typical Tory approach in that its main concern and emphasis is protection of property and property rights. I think the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) mentioned that today. The government's main concern, according to the budget, is assisting in the maintenance of the police force and the fire department, and at the same time, to achieve something else, to enable the hon. Attorney-General to advance in the direction of a more unified police control of the whole province, so that he could even step over the heads of a municipal government and the Mayor and direct the forces. It is typical of the thinking of Tories.

Now, contrast all this with the miserly way with which social welfare problems have been treated in the budget. Not a penny more provided for mothers' allowances, and as for old-age pensions, there has been so much said, and I want to repeat something which I said in a previous speech. I charged this government with "sponging" on charitable organizations insofar as old-age pensions are concerned.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I should say that I read over the correspondence which my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) tabled here, and I say to this House, there was not one iota of truth in that correspondence, that this government had "sponged" on any charitable organization.

Furthermore, the government is paying, with the old-age pension plus the ten cents a day, $33 a month to those in institutions, and while some of the institutions said: "Of course we would like to get more money," there has not been a single, solitary one of those institutions come to this government and ask for more money.

Furthermore, in the correspondence it is all a figment of my hon. friend's (Mr. Salsberg) imagination. He imagined the whole thing. He wrote the letters; there was not a letter from one charitable organization bearing out what he said, and also, since he made that address, the very people whom he mentioned have come to us and said they wanted to have nothing to do with him at all, that they were quite satisfied.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, you have no idea how much I appreciate this interjection. I was waiting for it.

MR. FROST: Well, all right.

MR. SALSBERG: I welcome it. I am thankful for it.

MR. FROST: Well, O.K.

MR. SALSBERG: Because, believe it or not, I am quite naïve, and I tabled correspondence instead of reading the correspondence.

MR. FROST: There was nothing to it. Nothing in it at all.

MR. SALSBERG: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read one letter of those which were tabled. Hon. members will recall, I am sure, every word the hon. Provincial Treasurer

(Mr. Frost) has said a minute ago: "There was no truth," "a figment of my imagination," et cetera, et cetera.

MR. FROST: I challenge my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) to take the correspondence he tabled here the other day and read it aloud to this House, and I say to hon. members of this House there is not one tittle of evidence, nothing to support what my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) said. Not a thing.

MR. SALSBERG: That is what is called "sticking one's neck out." The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has done it.

MR. FROST: All right, read it. This may be something else. I have not seen this.

MR. SALSBERG: I will read it.

MR. FROST: You read what was tabled.

MR. SALSBERG: I am reading to this House now a letter which the Commissioner of Public Welfare of the City of Toronto sent to me.

MR. FROST: That is not a letter you have got there. That is a piece of foolscap.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker—

MR. FROST: Could I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) to table that piece of paper?

MR. SALSBERG: We have evidently gone very far—

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: —when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) who knows what is coming, is beginning to question whether I am reading an original letter. It is just a piece of paper.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. SALSBERG: I put the piece of paper down, I shall read from the original which was tabled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: As No. 11. This was a letter which the Commissioner of Public Welfare of the City of Toronto, sent me on November 22nd, in which he—

MR. FROST: Last?

MR. SALSBERG: A letter which he received from Miss Florence L. Philpott, Executive Secretary of the Welfare Council of Toronto.

MR. FROST: Why did you not table that, may I ask?

MR. SALSBERG: I beg your pardon, that is tabled, sir.

MR. FROST: That was not in the tabled correspondence.

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry, that is tabled. I assure you it is tabled, it was marked No. 11.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L. Waterloo North): You mean a copy of it?

MR. SALSBERG: Copies of it were made later, but they were all tabled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Read it, read it.

MR. SALSBERG: And the Press saw it, I am sure. I am going to read it. This letter addressed to the Commissioner of Public Welfare of the City of Toronto, reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. Commissioner:"

It is dated November 9th, 1948,

"Your inquiry regarding old-age pensions of those cared for in private institutions, addressed to Mr. Dewar, has been referred on to the Welfare Council. Our Old-Age Division has given me the following information.

On July 21, 1947, the Welfare Council wrote to Premier Drew, urging that $40 a month be paid to all pensioners, whether living in their own homes, with relatives, in rooming houses or in institutions. On March 18, 1948, the Welfare Council wrote to Mr. B. W. Heise, Deputy Minister of Public Welfare for Ontario, asking for information

regarding legislation which prevented more than $30 per month being paid to old-age pensioners resident in old-age institutions. Mr. Heise's reply stated that the regulation No. 8 affected the bonus and reads: 'This part shall not apply to a pensioner residing in a county home for the aged or any charitable institution defined as a charitable institution under The Charitable Institutions Act.' "

MR. FROST: That is right. That is quite clear.

MR. SALSBERG:

"Regulation No. 8 as given in Mr. Heise's letter and quoted above introduces a discriminatory note in old-age pension legislation."

MR. FROST: That is just what she says.

MR. SALSBERG:

"Canada, in introducing her old-age pension legislation was ahead of the United States and Great Britain. In this particular matter, our federal government had intended to follow the lead of Great Britain and the United States—"

MR. FROST: How does she know that?

MR. SALSBERG:

"—and make old-age pensions not payable to residents of homes for the aged. However, several groups made representation to the federal government at the time that the old-age pension legislation was under consideration, urging that pensions be paid to all old persons, regardless of their state of residence. Consequently, we came out with very excellent legislation in the beginning which made no discrimination against residents of homes for the aged. Regulation No. 8 to which Mr. Salsberg's letter takes exception says, in effect, that if an old-age pensioner—"

And I would ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer to listen carefully—

MR. FROST: That is right. Those are all her opinions.

MR. SALSBERG:

"—if an old-age pensioner boards at a private address and has to pay $30 a month to the landlady for inferior accommodation, the province will pay $40 a month. But if next month she should be given superior accommodation at an old people's home, where the cost per person would be approximately $42 a month for women—"

MR. FROST: Well, that is just her opinion.

MR. SALSBERG:

"the old-age pensioner will be given only $30 a month, of which she must pay $25 to the Home.

"The Welfare Council has been greatly concerned about this regulation No. 8, and has continued to write to the Provincial Government on the matter. We also know that boards of the several Homes for the Aged have made their own representations in this matter to the Ontario Department of Welfare.

"I hope that this is the information that you require, and we also sincerely hope that some pressure will be brought to bear on the Ontario Department of Welfare to make a change in this ruling which is regarded by all of us as unfair.

Yours truly,

(Signed) FLORENCE L. PHILPOTT,
Executive Secretary."

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say this, that letter proves exactly nothing. It says—

MR. SALSBERG: Oh—

MR. FROST: Just a minute. It contains a number of opinions expressed by Miss Philpott which, by the way, are not accurate. The situation is this: The Old-age Pension Commission is paying to those homes $30, plus a bonus of $3.10 a month, $33.10 a month, which my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) con-

veniently forgets, and he was on the council in Toronto and knows that is being paid, but he just wants to mislead and mislead. The fact is, he knows perfectly well those institutions are getting $33.10 a month.

The other thing is this: my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) got up here and blatantly said the other day that government— and I suppose the Federal and Provincial Governments—were "sponging" on the municipalities. Now, there is not one tittle of evidence in that letter, nor in the letters which were filed, to show the municipalities are losing a single, solitary cent; and the fact of the matter is that the Jewish Home—or is it The Jewish Old People's Home there—

MR. SALSBERG: This letter was not—

MR. FROST: They came to us and said they wanted nothing to do with this representation being made by my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg), because they are quite satisfied.

Now, then, I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) will withdraw the statement he made the other day.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Mr. Speaker—

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I gave more than sufficient evidence to substantiate the charge I made—

MR. FROST: All right, read the correspondence. There is nothing in it. Nothing.

MR. SALSBERG: —that this government is "sponging" on charitable institutions.

MR. FROST: There is nothing. Not at all.

MR. SALSBERG: That was a statement of the Welfare Council of Toronto, and I am not making representations on behalf of any single organization, whether Jewish, Chinese, Ukrainian or Irish.

MR. FROST: My friend is just talking through his hat. These various organizations want to have nothing to do with him.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I say the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is just inventing things. He is talking about organizations which would not have anything to do with me. I read the letter from the official body, and they say they have approached you without success. The facts, regardless of how you wiggle, are these: That when the old-age pensioner gets $40 a month and enters an institution, you cut it down to $30, and you give the institution 10 cents *per diem* allowance in addition.

MR. FROST: Which you forgot to mention.

MR. SALSBERG: I forgot nothing. If you had stopped heckling, you would have gotten all the facts, but you were so touched by all the facts I laid before this House, that you could not resist heckling.

Mr. Speaker, may I proceed?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) would not have mentioned the $3.10 a month, if he had not been checked up. He had no intention whatsoever of mentioning it—

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost)—

MR. FROST: If my friend (Mr. Temple) would keep his long nose out of this, and leave it to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)—

MR. SPEAKER: A question must be directed through the Speaker to the one who has the floor.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker—

MR. JOLLIFFE: That was a very improper remark.

MR. R. SCOTT (CCF Beaches): Most of his remarks are.

MR. SALSBERG: When one is short of logical remarks, one resorts to such things. The fact remains, that

old-age pensioners are not provided for adequately, and the advance which is contained in Bill No. 110, which I acknowledged here yesterday, is continuing, notwithstanding the policy of denying assistance to these private institutions for the aged which I have mentioned. That is true, of all of them. There will be a chance to say more about the old-age pensions, but I want to serve fair warning on the government that as far as this member is concerned, he does not care if it will be found necessary to prolong the Sessions of this House for as long as possible in this 1949 Session, in order to compel the government to grant at least the $10 supplementary allowance to all old-age pensioners. You may call it "filibustering," or call it anything else. I have no intention of starting a filibuster tonight—

MR. FROST: Why not? This would be a good time to have it. Speak all night.

MR. SALSBERG: I will choose the night.

MR. PORTER: You want a bigger audience.

MR. SALSBERG: I am quite sure there are enough hon. members in this House who consider action such as that justified. If it will cause this government to unloosen to meet the needs of the aged people.

I meant to say something about the Department of Labour, but I think I will forgo that, and turn to it on another occasion. I just want to say this, however, that the hon. Minister of Labour's (Mr. Daley) refusal to convene the Standing Committee on Labour, which I requested him to do, does not dispose of the situation I have brought to the attention of this House in regard to the factory inspection branch. If the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) thinks that by getting up and saying he does not think the members of the Committee should be brought together, and the hon. members of this House should not look into the operations of that branch, in the face of the facts I presented to the House, then I assure him the matter is not ended, because this House is not the only tribunal to which complaints of this sort will have to be brought, if the government should show a stubborn resistance to granting an elementary request to convene a Standing Committee which has not met in five years, and give us the opportunity of looking into complaints of such a character as the one I make.

Now that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has come in, I want to say that while the Department of Labour is backward—very backward—

MR. BLACKWELL: I hope I have not started you all over again.

MR. FROST: He was just going to sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: Most of the Labour Department matters are handled by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and his handling of them is bad, and it is bad because unfortunately his answer is very simple—

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, there is not a vestige of truth in that statement, and the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) knows it very well. The Attorney-General's Department only comes into labour relations in regard to the policing, on the request of the municipalities. It is true, that a number of years ago I was acting Minister of Labour at the time of the Ford strike, but since that time I have not had anything to do with the actual administration of the affairs of the Department of Labour.

MR. SALSBERG: Merely to deny that the statement the hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) has made is correct. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) said that my remarks were a lie, that he has nothing to do with the Department of Labour.

MR. BLACKWELL: You interpreted it a little more abruptly than I put it.

MR. SALSBERG: I want to say

that is not true. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has just come in, and did not have a chance to hear a word I uttered, but it was not a minute until he was on his feet to deny something. But the record is very clear, and a very, very unsavoury one.

MR. BLACKWELL: What do you mean by "unsavoury?"

MR. SALSBERG: A record that is unsavoury amongst all workers—

MR. BLACKWELL: You mean agitators.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, it is so easy to bring up "agitators," and Mr. Speaker, if I might say so, it is so common. But the delegation of workers which were in to see the hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) two days ago were not agitators.

MR. BLACKWELL: What delegation?

MR. SALSBERG: The delegation from the Federation of Labour.

MR. FROST: They would not have you speaking for them.

MR. SALSBERG: What they said, as is reported in the newspapers, certainly shows a very strong criticism of the way the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) operates his department during a strike. Here is a headline from the *London Press* of March 15th—

MR. BLACKWELL: What does it say? I cannot read it from here.

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) cannot read it—

MR. BLACKWELL: I said, from here.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not on account of his eyes.

This heading says: "Blackwell evades Sarnia C.S.U. shooting appeal." I was not at the meeting, but the press was, and I am quoting from the press.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) will permit me, in view of the fact that a statement was made here from a headline to the hon. members of this House, I feel I have the perfect liberty to explain in the House the exact status of that appeal, and I will try to do so in much the same language as before—

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker—

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) made the statement, and I am at liberty to correct it.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) has the right to ask a question. He has not asked a question; he is making a speech. At any rate, let him not assume he has the right.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member—

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SALSBERG: Let Mr. Speaker rule. I think every hon. member sits down when Mr. Speaker is on his feet.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) having sat down, it is an acknowledgement that he is giving way and allowing the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to proceed.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, if I may—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker is standing up. You are out of order. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: The acknowledgement is given either for a question or explanation if the hon. member having the floor sits down, and I think the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) did sit down, and thus gave way to the hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) who wishes to make an explanation.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I merely want to make it clear it is not a matter of right on the part of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). It

is only by consent of Mr. Speaker that he makes his statement now, because he has spoken implying "You had your say, now let me have mine." I am perfectly willing to allow the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to make his statement at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Consent is given by an hon. member taking his seat, which is exactly what the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) did.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I feel that some of the hon. members of the House would like to hear the truth in relation to that appeal, and I will try to express it quite briefly, and as far as possible in the same language I did to the labour delegation mentioned by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg).

The fact of the matter is that when the chief engineer of the steamship in question used a shotgun to repel six boarders, what happened was that the boarders were arrested and charged by the local police. The chief engineer was not arrested and charged.

In the opinion of the Department of the Attorney-General, there was a question as to whether the use of the shotgun under these circumstances was justified, and, accordingly, I felt there was a case to go to the courts, and I directed from the department that these charges be laid. That should be known here.

What happened was, the case was tried before an ordinary citizens' jury, and the jury acquitted the chief engineer. When that happened, the department obtained the evidence and very carefully examined it. I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will appreciate that the Attorney-General has no status to appeal acquittals, unless there is a misdirection by the trial judge or some other basis for the appeal. We cannot appeal a simple matter of an acquittal, and in the opinion of the official of the department, upon a most careful examination of the evidence, it was that there was no ground for the appeal.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no intention, just to satisfy the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) of making a circus of the Attorney-General's Department, just to appease him—

MR. SALSBERG: I think, Mr. Speaker, the reply has been made, and any speech by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) can be made in due time.

MR. BLACKWELL: What you were taking objection to was whether it was a correct adjudication by a jury upon the facts, in a strict sense, and you now have the opportunity of knowing what an ordinary Canadian jury thinks of the antics of some people in relation to strikes.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) could not help but be himself in his last remarks. That is just what the workers of this province think of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). He could not help but take the last "dig," that "this is what the jury thinks of strikes." Did you get that, Mr. Speaker? I do not think it was called for. I do not think it bespeaks the thinking of juries about strikes. That jury did not deal with strikes in the abstract.

MR. BLACKWELL: No, they dealt with law.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not a lawyer, and I will not argue this point.

In closing my remarks about the government's labour policy, and the way it handles labour problems, I say that the workers of this province have no confidence in this government, and look upon this government as an instrument of "big business."

MR. FROST: They do not think much of you, either. I notice that most of them are weeding out the Communists.

MR. SALSBERG: That is beside the point.

MR. PORTER: What alternative do you suggest?

MR. SALSBERG: You are the government.

MR. FROST: You are the Communists.

MR. SALSBERG: That is right. So what are you discovering? A new America?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: Now a word on housing—

MR. BLACKWELL: You are not going to leave me now, are you?

MR. SALSBERG: You are in housing, too.

MR. FROST: You covered that before.

MR. SALSBERG: The housing policy of the government is an outstanding scene, I think, of the whole flim-flam Act, of which I spoke before. I cannot help but repeat that the second mortgage proposal means nothing in the solution of the housing problem—nothing. If you want to know what this government should do or can do—and I can remind the former hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) now again; I did it earlier in the evening, but unfortunately he was out, and he saved himself the embarrassment of listening to what I read. Let him read the headlines. One is from the *Globe and Mail* of March 9th, 1949, and it reads:

> "Suburbs offer 3,000 lots if province pays schools, and Ottawa pays taxload.
>
> "The City of Toronto has canvassed the representatives of the adjoining municipalities, and it is crystal clear that thousands of homes could be built for the homeless ones in Toronto, providing this government assumed the responsibility for certain services, which the adjoining municipalities are unable to assume, financially."

That is all. The City of Toronto cannot assume it all. Oh, I know you made a proposal last year for a certain amount per house, but that was inadequate.

MR. PORTER: That was what they wanted.

MR. SALSBERG: The amount is inadequate.

MR. PORTER: That is exactly what they were asking for.

MR. SALSBERG: No, not the amount. We could have thousands of houses built in the township and in the other adjoining municipalities, if the Provincial Government would assume the cost of education and the building of schools, and other services, which the adjoining municipalities would have to provide, and it would bankrupt those municipalities, and so they want assurances, and the assumption of more responsibility by other governments to justify their undertaking these big projects, and so long as this government does not want to face up to this task of the housing problem, of course, the people will not be served. And this is only one segment of the housing problem, and which I believe this government could undertake if it only had—the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) said "a belief," but I say if this government only had a willingness to do it, and the proper approach to it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: That did not work.

MR. FROST: Be careful.

MR. SALSBERG: You had better not. I might change my mind. I will conclude by saying to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that he should not feel so proud at having these people around him complimenting him for being a level-headed man. The hon. members of the government complimented him, as I recall it, by saying it was a "very level-headed budget," and that "the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was a very level-headed man."

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of Stephen Leacock, who told a wonderful story about level-headed people. He said, "Since when is it a virtue to have a level head? Imagine the state of affairs if all the good people's heads were level."

MR. FROST: Are you level-headed?

MR. SALSBERG: I am well balanced, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Do not try to become level-headed, Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), and do not seek the compliments of those who think "level-headedness" means that you are hanging on to the purse strings where it affects the well-being of the people and loosening them when it comes to the police and fire protection, and things like that. I would sooner see the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) show a greater social consciousness of what is required. I would like to see him provide subsidies for milk—there will be much said about milk in the near future, from the members of the Milk Producers' Association. I am sorry to predict that, but it is true. The consumption of milk is dropping to a catastrophic level, and I think it would be a greater compliment to the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) if he were to provide a subsidy to increase the consumption of milk, or to provide free milk for all school children in the schools, rather than to be told he is "level-headed." Then he would be well-balanced. I hope he will, in the future, show greater concern for the classes of people about which he speaks when he is referring to other items; widows and orphans; the favoured group, bankers, trust company heads, and spokesmen for big corporations, when defending their interests, presents themselves as the guardians for widows and orphans in connection with relief from Succession Duties. I would rather see the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) more concerned about the widows and orphans who require the Mothers' Allowances, than to be told he is "level-headed." I would rather see him show some concern over a situation which is developing rapidly, unfortunately, in connection with the unemployed.

Just a word about that. A newspaper last week in Toronto reported a Nova Scotian who was injured by falling under the wheels of a railroad car on a dark, cold night, down at the freight yards, and the Toronto police reported that a large number of transients have been sleeping in vacant cars. One day when 20 or 30 were rounded up, the police report that the majority of them gave Maritime addresses and they were moving westward in search of work. I wish the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in his Budget had shown concern for that group. I do not think he has. I wish he would have tried in the Budget, instead of wanting to be level-headed, and trying to satisfy some elements which may be the crowners of kings and the makers of party leaders, he would have tried to implement the promise which Dr. Vivian made in 1943, concerning the feeling of fear of those who are sick and who may be called upon to leave the members of their family without support except for relief. Dr. Vivian promised that in 1943, and I do wish the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would have shown some concern for them. I am sorry to say he did not.

That is the trouble with the Budget, it is a bad Budget.

MR. FROST: That is what you have said for the last five years.

MR. SALSBERG: And it can be said again for hours and hours, and I predict, Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that it will be said about this Budget for a long time, at least for the whole of the coming year, because, as far as I am concerned, I assure you I would rather—

MR. FROST: That is what you said last year and the year before that, and the year before that.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, two years ago and three years ago. But you give me no chance because you want to be

level-headed instead of being socially minded, socially conscious, things which unfortunately you have not shown in this Budget.

MR. G. E. PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I suppose we will continue with this debate tomorrow, and, in the event we conclude the debate tomorrow, I wonder if the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) could tell us whether we would be going on with the Estimates and Bills?

MR. FROST: I understood the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) made an arrangement with my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) to finish the Budget tomorrow and then go ahead with the Bills on the Order Papers.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.04 of the clock, p.m.

Vol. III, No. 25

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 16, 1949

The Barristers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Thornberry, first reading..... 927

The Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Ellis, first reading..... 927

The Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Fell, first reading..... 928

Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading..... 928

Local Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, first reading..... 928

The Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dennison, first reading..... 928

Fire Departments Act, introduced by Mr. Blackwell..... 928

Motion to Adjourn Debate, Mr. Wismer, agreed to..... 955

Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to..... 956

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1949.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: In view of the absence of many of the hon. members while attending the funeral of the late Walter B. Reynolds, a total revision of the mimeographed copies of *Hansard* for Monday by members could not be completed until today. With that in mind, the printed copy of *Hansard* will not be ready for distribution until Friday.

It has been drawn to my attention that hon. members who use extensive quotations from various sources in their addresses have a tendency to retain the same after the address has been completed. I am sure all hon. members will appreciate the very great importance of *Hansard* reporters obtaining the actual copy of such quotations as soon as the address is completed. Your co-operation in this matter will be very greatly appreciated.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE BARRISTERS ACT

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Wismer, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Barristers Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, would my hon. friend (Mr. Thornberry) say what he means to do with the barristers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: This is merely "tidying up" legislation—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY:—and will prohibit mass production of K.C's.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Well, you people got some.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): It helped the election campaign.

AN HON. MEMBER: You did not refuse it.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Walters, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend the Municipal Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member (Mr. Ellis) would give us a brief explanation of the bill?

MR. ELLIS: This is to extend to other municipalities the same right to make by-laws on smoke abatement as is

now contained in the private bill of the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

MR. L. F. K. FELL (CCF Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Ontario), that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Would my hon. friend (Mr. Fell) explain the bill?

MR. FELL: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide broader protection in cases where the effect of an accident is to aggravate a pre-existing condition.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) give us an explanation, please?

MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, there is not very much to this bill. In the Ontario Municipal Board Act, they had power to arbitrate between employees of public utilities and different companies. We do not think that should be in the Municipal Board Act at all. We think it should be dealt with by the Department of Labour, when they have the machinery set up for that purpose.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. J. L. EASTON (CCF Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) explain?

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) tell us what it is all about?

MR. DUNBAR: In the Municipal Act, you know there is always something cropping up, and this is another instance. This applies to a muncipality, or a few municipalities, which found on installing their sewers, they had power to charge those benefitting, but not directly fronting on the sewers, for the outlet of the sewers, but did not have any power to charge if there was pumpage. We have had some instances where a sewer has to be pumped out some distance in order to flow out properly, and this is to give them power to charge for the cost of that pumping.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Leavens, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 73.

FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 73rd Order; second reading of Bill No. 107, "The Fire Departments Act, 1949," Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 107, "The Fire Departments Act, 1949."

MR. H. W. WALKER (L Welland): Mr. Speaker—

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member (Mr. Walker) wishes to say something—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Go ahead, go ahead.

MR. BLACKWELL: All right.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): We are eager to hear this.

AN HON. MEMBER: It better be good.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of convenience, this bill is divided into two parts. In this discussion, I feel we can pass rapidly over Part I, as that part is a consolidation of previous amendments of the Act, and it contains but one small change in principle, which I will mention.

That small change in principle is the removal of the fire chief from the collective-bargaining unit on the theory that he is really an executive officer of the municipality. The amendment meets representations made by municipalities in that respect.

Part 2 of the bill is new.

I should say at the outset that it represents one of a series of measures, all of which together represent an integrated policy in relation to provincial grants. First, however, I would like to deal with the evolution which has taken place under Part I of this bill, during the period since 1943. I do that for this reason: much has appeared in the press in relation to this bill and in reference to The Police Act about the "infringement of municipal autonomy."

I might say that, in principle, there was some infringement of municipal autonomy in relation to fire departments, in the sense that, prior to 1943, that under the Fire Departments Act of that time working conditions of firemen in the Province of Ontario were regulated to a degree by an Act of this Legislature. I refer to the provisions governing the establishment of two-platoon systems in fire departments, and limiting the hours of work in fire departments to 72 hours a week in relation to that two-platoon system, and also to the provision governing the calling back of firemen and the requirement to maintain those two platoons at efficient strength. Therefore, may I say at the outset, that prior to this government taking office, previous administrations had found it necessary, or expedient, as a matter of public policy in this province, to that degree to infringe on the so-called "autonomy" of municipalities.

Following 1943, the first measure introduced by way of revision of those provisions was a clarification of the two-platoon system, because, although most of the municipalities of the province having full-time fire departments, having observed that, there were still some who were not observing those provisions. Therefore, the provisions were clarified, and I wish to say that without the necessity of issuing any directives or using the "heavy hand" in relation to a single municipality in this province, full compliance with that legislation was brought about by the simple medium of discussion between the department and the municipalities —a method I might say, which I wish to commend.

The next amendment was to create, not a mandatory but a permissive three-platoon system in the departments of the province, so that no question would arise by reason of the other provision of the legality of introducing a three-platoon system, or some variation between the two and three-platoon systems that met with the agreement of both those in the fire department and the municipality.

I want now to come to what might be described as another "infringement" —if I may use that expression to bring this matter into proportion—another "infringement of municipal autonomy."

Infringement, Mr. Speaker, was not

even thought of by any provincial administration. This was an infringement of municipal autonomy that was brought into being and permitted by the municipalities themselves. I refer to the fact that in the organized fire departments of the Province of Ontario, the municipalities themselves, on their own volition, without any suggestion from the province or any legislation by the province, permitted the unionization of those fire departments.

In those fire departments the locals of the A.F. of L. Union, the International Firefighters Union, established themselves, and union representation in those departments reached, if my information is right, about 98 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, when many of the municipalities of the province did that, on their own volition, they introduced something entirely different from the old public-service concepts, whereby the representatives of the people determined all these things, and they accepted—no matter how badly they employed—the principle that the unions would function and wages and working conditions would be the subject matter of collective bargaining.

However, unfortunately, except in a limited number of cases, all the disability and the difficulty which developed in collective bargaining industrially—much of which has been overcome—began to repeat itself in this municipal service, and what many of our municipal councillors in this province had forgotten was that the executive of a local labour union or of a federation of labour unions, is, in his way, a politician just in the same sense that we here are politicians, and that those who are municipal councillors are politicians. That person has a constituency, and his constituency is the union, and unless a decent citizen who holds such a responsible position in a labour union is able to transact decent business under the accepted conditions of transacting that business, he cannot retain the confidence of his constituency, which is that local union. That, Mr. Speaker, means—and every person in politics is familiar with what happens—that a person who has some sense of responsibility then becomes, by the exercise of the franchise in the union, supplanted by someone who is probably a lot worse for the ultimate interests of the union, the municipality and the public.

In relation to that, Mr. Speaker, a real problem was developing throughout this province. I wish to assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that the very sound leadership this A.F. of L. union had given was in grave danger of being supplanted by those who wished to remove from the charter of that A.F. of L. union its "no strike" clause and bring to power within the union a group who had no other thought but strikes throughout the Province of Ontario in such an important public service as fire-fighting.

Having regard to the important—

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) a question, if it will not throw him off? He spoke of people who are proposing that the "no strike" clause be deleted from the constitution. Who were these people, and where was that done?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I went to the meeting of the Federation in, I believe it was London, in 1946, and without coming down—I do not think the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) expects me to name names and persons—

MR. MacLEOD: Well, no, not—

MR. BLACKWELL: —but there was a definite promotion going on which filled these labour unions with dismay, to change the officers of the union and to remove that "no strike" clause; and, as a matter of fact, at that meeting, a resolution was carried to remove it, but finally, with the hope of some provincial action, the cooler and wiser heads prevailed and the international union threw out the resolution.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Are you referring to the Fire-fighters Union? Is that the idea?

MR. BLACKWELL: I thought I was talking about fire-fighting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SALSBERG: I wanted to make sure.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is what I was talking about.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): That "no strike" clause is in the international constitution. It is not anywhere else.

MR. BLACKWELL: I appreciate that.

MR. PARK: It could not be removed locally.

MR. BLACKWELL: It could not be removed locally, but the steam which was growing up to remove it locally was there among members of the fire departments and members of those unions, and when enough steam builds up, here and elsewhere, those things do get removed.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is democracy.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am not suggesting whether it is or not, I am merely telling facts, and I am not trying to argue about it. Mr. Speaker, that brings me to this point: this administration felt that, having regard to the importance of the public service of fire-fighting, it was justified in introducing collective-bargaining provisions in the Fire Departments Act, which was done in the Legislative session of 1947, and in view of the fact this was an important public service where there should be no strikes, it was decided that, as that sanction—if I may use that expression—was not available for determining disagreements, then there must be substituted the sanction of compulsory arbitration. That Act passed the Legislature in 1947.

The result of collective bargaining with arbitration and the improvement in the working conditions and wages in its turn unquestionably imposed burdens on municipalities, as a direct consequence of that policy adopted in this Legislature. I review that, Mr. Speaker, because it is a necessary part of considering the question of the interference with the autonomy of municipalities, and there is already, as we bring Part II of this Act before this Legislature, for the reasons I have mentioned above, that degree of interference with autonomy.

This government felt, that, having interfered on one side to create standards, if that was a tenable policy of provincial administration, it followed that perhaps, as it was imposing those burdens, there should be a contribution from public funds to support the maintenance of that policy.

I put forward Part II of this bill in relation to that background and some other matters which I will mention as fully justifiable public policy of a provincial administration in the Province of Ontario.

I submit to this Legislature that the improvements it will create—and I will not attempt to enumerate all of them—but, in particular, with the improvement of our fire departments there will be a decrease in fire insurance premiums in municipalities to the benefit of the same people who now pay municipal taxes. There will be a better protection from fire loss itself, and all the consequences it brings in its train, on the one side, and on the other side, damage to goods and property. I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that on the question of damage to goods and property; if there is a fire it makes a great difference whether the fire department which goes in on that fire is a well-trained one or an ill-trained one, in the consequences to the property and goods which may be situated on that property.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to a reason why the Legislature of this province are having regard to the matter of efficiency of fire departments in the day and age in which we live.

We live, Mr. Speaker, under the constant and continuing possibility of national emergency. I want to say, in this House, in all seriousness, that our fire departments in this province

are in no condition to meet that sort of national emergency if it comes. I can give you one simple example. We have in the fire departments of the province hydrant and hose couplings of 94 different varieties, and if we had a calamity in a single municipality today, departments from adjoining municipalities would be useless. I want to say, in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that if the administration at Ottawa and this administration and the administrations of the municipalities permit such a condition, and such an emergency arises, they will live to be damned by the citizens of this province. I say that in all seriousness.

On that question I see by today's *Telegram* that what I said yesterday to the delegation which came here, came to the attention of the hon. Minister of National Defence, the Hon. Brook Claxton, who happened to be in Hamilton. It says, today, that he endorses Attorney-General Blackwell's reference in regard to national emergencies. He took the position that these standards were entirely necessary, and he mentioned that this had been a matter of discussion between the representatives of the Dominion Government and the Premier of the Province. Now, it so happened that I was delegated by my cabinet colleagues to discuss this matter with the dominion officials, and so we have in our department knowledge of deficiencies in standardization of equipment in the sections which would apply in the case of emergency. That was only one of the reasons for bringing forward this particular bill.

And now, coming specifically to the bill itself. The second section in Part 2, is the one which deals with the grants. I do not need to dwell on the percentages there, all the members have read them. They have been worked out on the basis of the ability of the various types of municipalities to pay.

In the second part of the section are subsidy details so there will be no doubt as to what is the nature of the costs to be taken into account for subsidy purposes. Also, in subsection 3, note is taken of the fact that there are certain municipalities in the province which maintain no department of their own but which rely on agreements with an adjoining municipality for their protection. They are unable to participate in the subsidy payment on the basis of their payment under the agreement in question.

I want to discuss Section 13 for a moment. There are certain conditions precedent to grants. I want to say that with the establishment of union activity and collective bargaining in this field, every municipality which has not already got these minimum security provisions for fire-fighters will be faced, in the course of time, with negotiations and arbitration in relation to them. It seemed to us to be of assistance to the municipalities to include in the calculation of what the grant should be, an amount which would enable the municipality with relation to full-time fire-fighters, to stop all the wrangling and all the difficulty of evolution which is on its way in, by having a provision in the grant that these conditions precedent to be compiled with. In that respect I wish to emphasize that in relation to superannuation, the province is not attempting to prescribe what the scheme is. As long as the scheme is sound, it is acceptable. That simply means the small municipality, particularly where there may be one full-time man who may be called the "Fire Chief," or they may have two or three full-time men. This does not interfere with the age of retirement or in any way with the right of the municipality to appoint anybody under the circumstances, at whatever age the municipality wishes, it is for them to determine. Now, in order to make the matter effective this year—

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) a question? You use the word "soundness" in connection with this retirement or pension plan. Who is going to determine as to the soundness of the plan?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker,

as the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) probably knows, the Department of Municipal Affairs has worked out standard superannuation provisions for municipalities. If, under this bill, a municipality goes forward with a plan that meets that, it is obviously acceptable. The municipalities can adopt some other one as long as it is workable in relation to amounts collected and paid by the municipality. They can go to the Superintendent of Insurance and have any variation so long as the plan is sound.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? In order to come under this grant, if a municipality has two-thirds permanent employees and one-third volunteers, in order to get the pension, the volunteer men would have to join that pension scheme?

MR. BLACKWELL. The answer is that it would be impossible to place volunteer men under a scheme. It applies only to permanent employees. Now, Mr. Speaker, the bill includes an important provision for the smaller municipalities, the municipalities which desire to hold themselves down to volunteer departments. For smaller municipalities which want to improve their fire-fighting protection by obtaining an effective piece of equipment, it provides an additional subsidy of 10 per cent. for a new fire pumper. Now, if you put that with the preceding subsidy provisions it adds up to 35 per cent. in all for a proper type of pumper for a municipality getting its first pumper.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, assuming a fire department purchases $50,000 worth of equipment and spreads it over 10 years. Would they be permitted to apply for $5,000 or only 10 per cent. of the annual instalment? As I understand it, only the expenditure incurred in one year is permitted.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I intended to allude to that. Irrespective of the way that particular section is drafted in the bill at the moment, the intention is that even if the payment for equipment is deferred, the province will pay its subsidy immediately and get it over with.

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): On the total?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes, on the total.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Section 13, subsection (c) states:

> "Under which each full-time fire-fighter contributes not less than 5 per cent. of his salary or wages and the municipality contributes not less than an equal amount."

MR. BLACKWELL: Windsor will be able to improve its superannuation picture just a little bit.

MR. ELLIS: At the present time Windsor will not qualify under the scheme.

MR. BLACKWELL: You will have to put their superannuation up a little. I think it is the only one that is lower.

MR. ELLIS: The municipality pays a higher percentage than the employees and that makes up the difference. I think in the final analysis the percentage from both is about the same.

MR. BLACKWELL: As long as it is 10 per cent. coming both ways. If the municipalities want to pay more—

MR. ELLIS: The way it is now, Windsor does not qualify.

MR. BLACKWELL: If I might make this suggestion to the hon. members. I think I have exhibited that I am most anxious to answer any questions, but some of these questions would be better asked in Committee. They do not really affect the main principles of the bill. I would like to come to a conclusion as rapidly as I can and let hon. members speak on the principles. When the bill goes into committee, we can deal with these things there.

Section 14 provides for the method of

payment of one-half of the subsidy and that is on a proper certification of expenditures for the previous year. The other part of that section recognizes across the entire provincial field, that there are measures not only for full-time fire departments but every municipality in the province which has a fire department of any description. We must have protection under the bill against having to pay a grant of 100 per cent. subsidy for perfectly impossible types of equipment. We must see to it that workable and proper equipment is purchased by these grants.

Now, the fact of the matter is, as far as the large fire departments in our major cities and secondary cities are concerned, they are so close to efficiency in their personnel and most of their equipment is of a reasonable standard, that, I, on behalf of the government, assured the delegation I saw yesterday that they had nothing to worry about as far as any substantial refusal of the second part of that grant. I want to repeat that assurance here in the Legislature. I wish to emphasize that it will be the object of the department, as it has been in other branches of administration in relation to municipalities, to try to work out a standard and that is to be done on the basis of discussion and co-operation. We might find, after a year's experience with this bill, as we have found from experience in other matters, that it will require revision. Therefore, I say that the time for representations about what are these anticipated difficulties really never becomes closed. The government regards this measure of very substantial importance and a measure. in the final analysis, can only be judged by how well it actually works in practice. We intend to co-operate with the municipalities to the very best of our ability to see that it works well in practice.

Another important principle in the bill is the conception of the establishment of a Fire College. The reason for that is that within the confines of a single municipality there is not the space nor the safety in the use of the necessary equipment to give good training in the best methods of fire fighting. In order to do that there has to be space. Preferably such a fire college must be in reasonable proximity to one of the universities where some of the staff of the university is available for instructional purposes.

And this bill contemplates the establishment of such a fire college for the training not only of the officers in the fire departments, but also for the training of their personnel.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this bill, I come again to this; that the bill is part of an integrated policy of provincial grants, justified on the basis of an over-all provincial policy to be attained.

In relation to the question of the autonomy; what I have sketched; there is no interference with the autonomy of a municipality. The province is not undertaking to control in any way the hiring of the personnel of fire departments, including the appointment of their chiefs. The province is not undertaking, in any way, and has not power under this bill, to direct the operations of a fire department. Although I have been frank with the Legislature, and indicated perhaps what might be argued as a certain interference with autonomy, I am quite satisfied that when the merits of this bill, Mr. Speaker, are perceived by further study by our municipal councillors, and when it is understood by the public of this province, there will be support of it, and there will be public satisfaction with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has indicated that the principal objective of this bill is to raise the standard of fire-fighting departments throughout the province to the highest possible level, and to make them so efficient that they will be capable of coping with any emergency. I think it is safe to say there will be no disagreement with that objective. I do not think any hon. member of this House will disagree that is a good and proper

objective, and I do not think any municipality will disagree with that statement of such an objective.

But there is, and there will be, very great room for disagreement about the way in which the government has undertaken to attain that objective.

First of all, may I say there is one serious objection to the course the government is following, and that is the way it is dealing with the interested municipalities in Ontario.

MR. BLACKWELL: Have you a letter—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, I have a letter, and I do not think it is any laughing matter—

MR. BLACKWELL: You might read it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am going to read it. I do not think it is any laughing matter that a bill of such importance, important to the government and to the municipalities, should be considered without due regard for the representations which have already been made by municipalities, or those which they wish to make in the future.

As the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) suggests, I will read the letter, as I intended to do.

The letter I received, and which I assume was received by other hon. members of the House, is dated March 16, 1949. It is signed by Mr. K. Grant Crawford, Secretary-Treasurer of the Ontario Municipal Association, and by Mr. Seely Eakins, Executive Secretary, Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves. It is on the letterhead of the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves and I think should be made part of the record. It says:

"Dear Sir:

"The Executive of the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves and the Executive of the Ontario Municipal Association conferred with the Attorney-General yesterday regarding Bills Nos. 107 and 108, to provide for the Fire Departments and Police Act, 1949. These municipal representatives, after considering the explanation of the Attorney-General, are still strongly opposed to these bills and urgently request postponement of consideration of them by the Legislature until further representations are made to the Provincial Cabinet, with the Premier present.

"The municipal representatives consider that if such bills are enacted municipal autonomy will suffer considerably. It is pointed out that the one-mill subsidy was granted to municipalities without conditions, but the substitution of such subsidy, in part, by way of grants under the provisions proposed in these bills is conditional upon certain requirements with an apparent loss of municipal control over two municipal departments, police and fire.

"For the present, these associations urge that grants to municipalities, to the extent proposed in these bills, be made to municipalities without conditions determined by provincial officials as provided in these bills.

"The associations then urge the immediate appointment of a Provincial-Municipal Committee as promised repeatedly by the Government of Ontario to study and make recommendations to the government for permanent solutions for the re-defining of the municipal position, as suggested in the submissions of four municipal organizations presented to the government on October 19, 1947.

"Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Executives of the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves and the Ontario Municipal Association."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first objection is that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is asking this House, at this time, to give second reading to a bill which representatives of the municipalities have asked should be reconsidered, after they have had an opportunity of making representations to the government—not just to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), but to the government.

Whether we agree or disagree with

the statements in the letter, it would seem to me a reasonable and proper thing for the government to give these municipal representatives the opportunity they seek to make representations to the whole Cabinet, and in the presence of the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy).

But the objection goes even further. We have had no evidence whatever that there was any consultation with the municipalities before this bill was given first reading by this Legislature.

I appreciate that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has, in the Fire Marshal and others, civil servants who are very familiar with problems throughout the whole province. But, at the same time, I do not understand why a measure of such importance should be decided upon by the government without prior consultation with the municipalities, which are dealing with fire-department problems all the time.

I suppose one reason there was no discussion on it, was that the government already knew that fire departments represent one service in respect of which the municipalities were not asking for financial assistance. That was made perfectly clear in the briefs referred to, in a letter of October 19, 1948, in which the four municipal organizations—which perhaps I should mention, the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves, the Ontario Municipal Association, the Ontario Association of Rural Municipalities, and the Northwestern Ontario Municipal Association—asked the government for more financial assistance with respect to social service—

MR. FROST: And to remove the one-mill subsidy.

MR. BLACKWELL: And to remove collective bargaining.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will agree with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that they asked for certain changes in the Fire Department Act, but they did not ask for any financial assistance with respect to either their fire departments—

MR. BLACKWELL: Do you advocate we should remove these collective-bargaining features?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The point, from which I will not be diverted, is whether or not we agree with everything that is said in their letter or their brief, there are certain amenities, and certain standards of conduct which I think the government ought to respect in its dealings with the municipalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not saying you are under any legal obligation to consult with their organizations before you decide to introduce a bill affecting all municipalities. I am not saying that. But I do say that if you are going to keep faith with the municipalities and their organizations, it is only fair and reasonable—and it is expected by every municipality of this province—that you will give due consideration to their wishes, and at least give them the opportunity to make representations, before you have burned your bridges behind you.

MR. FROST: We will get the fire department out if that happens.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The fire department could not help you, if you insist on burning your own bridges behind you.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): They will be all "browned off" by that time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What the municipalities did ask for was pretty specific. I will not deal with them in detail at the moment. We will have more to say about them later on. But I do want to under-line that they specifically asked for more help for the social services, I am not saying they are not going to get more help, infinitesimal though it may be.

They said:

"After full study of the effect of social services upon the municipal financial resources in this modern

era, it is submitted that the costs of hospitalization, child welfare and welfare relief have been one of the major factors contributing to the burden on the municipal taxpayers for services not properly municipal services and, therefore, it is requested that municipalities be relieved entirely of these costs."

Mr. Speaker, what is perhaps more pertinent to the argument I am now advancing is that the brief, toward its conclusion, mentions consultation between provincial and municipal authorities—and I will read the paragraph put forward by the municipalities—and I suggest it is a pretty reasonable proposal. I would think it would commend itself, particularly to a government which has asked so many times for another Dominion-Provincial Conference, and which has emphasized repeatedly the importance of consultation between the federal and provincial governments, before the Federal Government burns any of its bridges behind it.

The brief says:

"It is, therefore, recommended that a committee of commission, composed of competent persons, be appointed to study and survey the whole field of provincial-municipal relationships and to make recommendations regarding any advisable changes with respect to the functional and financial relationships between the province and its municipalities. Pending the final conclusions of such a body, it is further recommended that it be instructed to make interim recommendations for interim financial adjustments as it may deem expedient to relieve the municipalities of the acute financial difficulties with which they are now confronted under the existing provincial-municipal arrangements."

Reference has been made previously at this session to the provincial-municipal conference originally suggested by the former hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Anderson), formally called together some months ago. That conference certainly could not have accomplished a great deal, when we find ourselves today considering a bill which the municipalities have had no adequate opportunity to consider.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) said a great deal today with which I can certainly agree. I am not going to quarrel with any of his arguments about the importance of standardization, nor the urgency of making some of the less efficient fire departments come up to the existing standard in the better fire departments. With all that, we can agree. But the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) did not demonstrate that additional financial grants are the only device whereby these standards can be improved. He has not discussed any alternatives. He is proceeding on the assumption that the only way to improve standards is to introduce this system of additional grants. I suggest that is not correct.

MR. BLACKWELL: I mentioned education. Maybe you did not hear me.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, the use of the College?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, and I agree it is a good idea.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am glad you do.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it is an excellent idea, to provide a place where training can be given, which cannot be adequately given in many of the municipalities. However, that is supplementary. The main scheme of the bill is to use additional grants as a weapon to bring certain municipalities up to a certain level. Is it necessary to establish a higher standard, by using that system and no other, apart from the College, which has been mentioned? I do not think so. There is a great deal of legislation which places obligations on the municipalities to do certain things—

MR. FROST: May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) a question? The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has always urged us to avail

ourselves of the health grants, for instance, made by the Dominion Government which tend to enlarge and create better conditions in relation to health. My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) has never objected to that. He thinks we should do that. Why then should he object to our adopting the same principle—

MR. MACLEOD: There was a lot of consultation on that.

MR. FROST: They never consulted us. We never heard a word of it until we got into the election last year.

MR. MACLEOD: You objected that they did not consult you.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not know that I have said very much about the federal health grants, and I hold no brief for the introduction of new legislation, without consultation with the provinces. Do not run away with the idea that I am saying there is one yardstick for the Federal Government, and another for the provincial.

MR. FROST. We called a conference last September and discussed the whole matter of municipal relations, and received briefs. This legislation is directly in line with what they recommend then, that is, the abolition of the one-mill subsidy and stream-lining other things. This we are doing. Following what the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has said, if that is not satisfactory, we are always willing to revise the plan. We intend to make it work. I do not think my friend should be alarmed about that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) said they had a conference last fall which, as I understand it, was much more of a social gathering.

MR. FROST: You should read the proceedings.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The treasurer (Mr. Frost) in his budget gave us the first information anybody has about a whole series of important new bills relating to municipal affairs. Were they discussed last fall? What was the conference for, if these matters were not to be discussed?

MR. BLACKWELL: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) wishes me to—I am sorry he looks down his nose on the fact there was some sociability at the gathering. Do you not ever like fun?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just answer my question about whether these bills were discussed.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Some of your men seemed to enjoy themselves there.

MR. BLACKWELL: The fact of the matter is, there was a conference in October, and as a result of that conference the municipalities presented a brief in relation to my department, to which are annexed the fire and police departments. What the brief said was "Get rid of the collective-bargaining provision." Possibly if the collective-bargaining provisions were not there, there would be one less reason for the grants. I want to ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) if he will plainly state—and not evade the question—if he is in favour of removing the collective-bargaining provisions from the bills?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is this another speech?

MR. MACLEOD: This is a filibuster.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not mind yielding the floor to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) at all, Mr. Speaker, if he will yield it to me. But I would point out that as the mover of the bill on second reading, he has the right to make the last speech in the debate, but if he wants to clarify something which needs clarification at the moment, I have no objection, providing he does not embark on another speech.

MR. BLACKWELL: The fact of the matter is that in February the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr

Dunbar) received a communication from Mr. Sam Lawrence, the mayor of Hamilton—which communication the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) may have seen. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) replied to that, in which communication he gave a plain, unequivocal indication to the municipalities that the brief presented had been forwarded to all the departments of government concerned, and that the different Ministers concerned with these recommendations were making their recommendations to the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost), with a view to effect being given to some of these representations, in a combined plan, and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) referred to the fact that there would be something in the budget about it. That was back in February, and the president of the Mayors and Reeves Association made no representations to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) at that time, or up until the presentation of these bills, that another course should be followed.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid this is getting away off the point. I do not expect the government to accept every recommendation or representation made to them by every organization which submits briefs of this kind. I do not expect that. Nobody does. They have the responsibility of deciding what to accept and what to reject.

But the point is this; the government had a conference with the municipalities last August, and following that conference, the government reached a decision to introduce the bills which, as the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has pointed out, form part of an integrated pattern. I cannot understand why the government did not call another conference with the municipalities and explain to them what it was proposing to do, to perhaps overcome some of the objections which are now being expressed, on very short notice, by the organizations of the municipalities.

After all, we have heard in recent years about the importance of due consultation between the Government of Ontario and the Government of Canada at Ottawa, the government's course of conduct in this matter surprises me. I just cannot understand it. We had one little conference last fall, and decisions of enormous importance were reached by the government, and they present them as a complete surprise to this House in the month of March. And when the municipalities interested want to make representations to the government—

MR. BLACKWELL: Would you answer the question I asked.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has a question, I will be glad to answer it, if it is a question, and not the beginning of another speech.

MR. BLACKWELL: The question is, does the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) think that the government should have given effect to the municipalities' recommendation to remove the collective-bargaining provisions from this bill?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Really, Mr. Speaker, that is a very silly question.

MR. BLACKWELL: I have been trying for ten minutes to get you to answer it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All right, but what I am discussing at the moment, is the course of conduct—

MR. BLACKWELL: Go ahead! Are you going to evade that question? You do not want that in the record?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have made it perfectly clear we do not expect the government to adopt all the recommendations made to it.

MR. BLACKWELL: What about this particular one?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, I will answer that question—most certainly.

MR. BLACKWELL: Good; hooray.

MR. JOLLIFFE: My answer is I do not think the fire departments should be exempted from collective bargaining.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And, furthermore, I do not think the police departments either should be deprived of their collective-bargaining rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is a plain mis-statement.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Neither do I think the civil servants of the Province of Ontario should be deprived of their collective-bargaining rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is a complete mis-statement of fact, Mr. Speaker, about a fact. They have collective-bargaining rights in the police departments—

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Oh, no, they have not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I know the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has reason to be disturbed about this matter—

MR. BLACKWELL: I have not. I finally got an answer.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think I am disturbing the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) very much. I think I know what is bothering him.

I will put on the record what happened yesterday following a meeting between the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and certain representatives of the municipalities. This appears in a newspaper, the accuracy of which the government will not question, the *Toronto Telegram,* of today, Wednesday, March 16, 1949, and it says:

"Dissatisfied with Attorney-General Leslie Blackwell's reaction to their protest yesterday against alleged provincial infringement upon municipal autonomy, Ontario mayors and reeves voiced a further appeal today to all members of the Legislature.

"A letter which went out from Mayor McCallum's office asks that the two measures providing for provincial aid to municipal police and fire services be held up pending further representations to the Cabinet, Mayor McCallum also sent personal telegrams to Premier Kennedy and members of his Cabinet.

"As he reported his action to Board of Control today, the Mayor indicated that he was not too pleased with the reception the mayors' delegation gained from Mr. Blackwell yesterday.

" 'I'm amazed that the member of Cabinet representing Toronto should have taken the stand that Mr. Blackwell took yesterday,' Controller Balfour said in Board of Control today.

"The mayor voiced hope that a delegation from the Mayors' and Reeves' Association can be heard by the Cabinet before the Legislature votes on the two measures which would give the province extended supervisory control over municipal police and fire services.

"Bringing Ontario police and fire departments up to maximum efficiency for national defence in the event of another war is the main reason why the Ontario Government plans to contribute to the operating expenses of such vital services in all Ontario municipalities.

"This broad underlying principle was outlined late yesterday to the Association of Mayors and Reeves, who met with Attorney-General Blackwell.

"When the government proposals were outlined in the Budget address, a number of municipalities, particularly Toronto, protested that the measures would deprive municipalities of control of these two vital

services. The municipalities claimed it meant the first step in depriving municipalities of their civic autonomy.

"When Blackwell introduced the bills in the House last week, he made no mention of the question of national defence requirements. He said at that time the major aim was efficiency.

"The association yesterday asked that, if the police and fire subsidies are to be paid, there be no strings attached such as requiring brigades and forces to have approved pension schemes, not to be in default on any collective-bargaining agreements, etc. No force nor brigade would get the full grant unless these requirements were met. Grants range from 25 per cent. for small centres down to 10 per cent. for Toronto, or all centres over 70,000 population.

"It is understood one of the main concerns of the government is that police forces be brought up to scratch in all centres should there be a national emergency. Then, too, there are many questions concerning standardization of fire departments equipment such as uniform, hose couplings and the like.

"The mayors' and reeves' organization urged that the terms of the bill 'without any strings' be temporary; also that each municipality be assured in 1949 of a government subsidy not less than received in 1948.

"The association held that financial assistance to the municipalities should not come in the form of fire and police grants, but should be in fields of social services. It regarded police and fire service as properly chargeable to real estate.

"Immediate appointment of a Provincial-Municipal Committee 'as often promised by the government,' to work out a permanent solution to municipal financial problems, was urged."

HON. G. H. DUNBAR: (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): I want you to answer one question. You mentioned Controller Balfour.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I did not mention him.

MR. DUNBAR: How did he get into this meeting? He is not a mayor.

MR. JOLLIFFE: My hon. friend (Mr. Dunbar) should probably ask the author of the report. I have put on record what no one can say is a report biased against the government.

I want to say this much; as this argument continues, there may perhaps be things said on behalf of the municipalities which will be well-founded, and there may be other things which may not be well-founded. I have very little sympathy with those from whom you sometimes hear that municipalities should be free to maintain standards much lower than those of surrounding municipalities. I think there is a responsibility to the people of the province as well as to the local rate-payers, but, I do not wonder the municipalities should be perturbed about the way this bill may be administered in view of the way the bill has been conceived and introduced and piloted through this Legislature. If I held municipal office, I would be very apprehensive about the way the government might make use of the conditional grants, having regard to the very peremptory fashion in which the municipalities have been dealt with, while this bill is under consideration. I do not doubt that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and his colleagues have given a lot of time and thought to it, but do they not think the municipalities may make proper suggestions regarding this matter? Do they think there are no suggestions they can make regarding improvement in this Legislation? Surely that cannot be, when you have good Conservatives like Mayor McCallum of Toronto against it. I may say that the opposition which has developed to this measure is certainly not organized on a partisan basis, because it is coming in much the same way from people who are well-known to be Conservative, Liberal and CCF members of municipal Councils. I would think that that might make the government pause for a moment. I think there

is food for thought in that fact. While they may not realize it, what they have done is to stir up a great deal of suspicion and apprehension about the intentions of the government. I have noticed in the estimates there is a small item for celebration of the centennial of municipal government in this province. The Baldwin Act, passed in 1849, is 100 years old in 1949, and no doubt my hon. friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is going to preside over what I suppose will be a very fine celebration.

MR. DUNBAR: Do you want that to be deleted?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not saying it should be deleted, I am sure the celebration will be very safe and sound in the hands of my hon. friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). That is my opinion. But what is worrying some of these municipal elected representatives is the fear that as 1849 marked the beginning of Municipal Government, now 1949 may mark the beginning of the end. I think many of these fears and objections could be overcome if the government would be more frank with the municipalities and would accept the entirely reasonable request that they be heard by the government in the presence of the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) and further and fuller consideration should be given to a bill of such importance as Bill No. 107.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L. Waterloo North): I rise to discuss this bill as one who has been a member of a city council for ten years and now representing a city in this Legislature.

As a former member of a municipal council, now a member of the Legislature, I try to appraise such matters as this from the standpoint of both the municipality and the government.

In speaking before this House I made the statement that on no occasion did I ever see any evidence of centralization on the part of members of the Provincial Legislature. I must confess now that my mind has been disabused, because I can see quite definitely a trend towards the taking over of certain powers which, in my opinion, should be left with the municipalities. We always have felt, as members of city council that there were certain things which should be our right to administer, and to enjoy, and the fire department, the police department, our own civic administration, etc., were among those items. It seems as though municipalities, without even being brought into discussion in connection with these matters, are now going to have to succumb to the Provincial Government, and to their dictation.

When the hon. The Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) was stating it was not their intention to infringe on municipal autonomy, his address reminded me very much of a similar type of address which I am sure would have been delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance in Ottawa (Mr. Abbott), without referring to provincial relations, but here it would appear the issue is definitely on the other foot.

Now, I did appreciate the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) remarks with respect to the foundation for bringing this Act into being, namely, that back, prior to 1943, there was legislative enactments to set up the two-platoon system and subsequently making it permissible to have a three-platoon system. But I submit, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that this is a matter of labour which fits into our entire labour scheme, and I think has nothing whatever to do with the administration of the fire departments, or of the police departments in our municipalities. If, as the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has stated, they felt it advisable and necessary to make grants in order to maintain or increase the standards of the fire department, then they should go one step further and give us grants also for the Works Department, and for other departments, which have been unionized in my city. All departments are unionized very efficiently, and it has resulted in a particularly high standard, but there is nothing suggested that they should be included by way of grants. It seems to me the government would have been

well-advised to do, first as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has very capably put it—called in the members or the executive of the Ontario Municipal Association and of the Ontario Mayors and Reeves and consulted with them to determine whether such a thing is feasible meets with their approval.

I think if that were done, it would possibly have helped the situation a very great deal. I also maintain, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that what this government should do, if they found it necessary to give these grants, they should give them. I have no objection to them giving grants, as long as they give them to all departments which have increased the standard in their municipalities, but, in addition to that they should also give the one-mill subsidy. They should not have taken that away, or the equivalent thereof.

I do not know what the objection is. It seems there has been some objection to the one-mill subsidy. We, in the City of Kitchener, were very pleased indeed to have it. It gave us an opportunity to maintain and in some cases to increase, our social services to the people of the municipality, and personally I am much more impressed with getting the money that way in order that the municipalities can spend it as they see fit, rather than to have the provincial government tell us how we should spend that one-mill subsidy, and if they could see fit to give us—in addition to the amounts voted for the fire department and police departments, and for the House of Refuge and Children's Aid Society—a further grant equivalent to a one-mill subsidy, it could be used to take care of indigent patients, unemployed employables, and people of that nature, and also something for old-age pensions.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Brown) must know the difficulty with the one-mill subsidy is the uneven way it works across the province. For instance, in the City of Toronto you have a very high assessment. In the City of Kitchener, the assessment might be 75 per cent., for instance, what it is in Toronto. In the Town of Barrie it might be 50 per cent. The result is with the present differences in our assessments, and with the revisions which are presently taking place, the whole thing is being thrown out of tune and it is unworkable and unfair. If my hon. friend (Mr. Brown) would compare the assessment in Toronto with the assessment in the City of Kitchener, he would say "That is pretty unequal, and should not be the yardstick," and probably as you go out into the smaller municipalities, the worse it gets.

MR. BROWN: I quite appreciate what the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has said, and I can sympathize with him. I feel the basis of assessment is not the matter on which subsidies should be given, but rather based on population. Then it would be equal in all cases.

I believe that is a 5 or 10-year programme which is now under way in many of these municipalities throughout the Province of Ontario, and no doubt that is what the City of Toronto undertook to do, with the result that now they find themselves, as the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) said, "behind the 8 ball."

MR. FROST: They are not very far "behind the 8 ball." They are going to get more money than they got before, you know.

MR. BROWN: I appreciate they are going to get more money, but the fact remains they are all going to spend more money.

MR. FROST: They are all going to get more money.

MR. BROWN: And they are going to spend more money for the Police and Fire Departments. Then, if he knows anything about municipal government, he will know that will spread out to all branches of municipal government, and the result is going to be that instead of a municipality getting a one-mill subsidy, by 1949 or 1950 they are going to have to spend an additional mill, which is going to come out of the property owners of those municipalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: That is what is coming, as sure as can be, and those are the things the government has not taken into consideration when they have established this method of dividing what is a substitute for the mill subsidy.

AN HON. MEMBER: They will get more money if they behave.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enlarge or to repeat what has, as I said before, been so capably said by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), but I do feel this bill should be held up until the municipalities have had an opportunity of discussing in detail the principle of this bill with the government, or the government with the Ontario Municipal Association, and with the Ontario mayors and reeves.

We are working towards one end, and that is unity, and, just as I said before, we are Canadians, so are we citizens of Ontario, and we are citizens of our own community and we must have co-operation and unity from the top down to the bottom.

It seems to me we cannot do it by these autocratic methods such as have been imposed in the presentation of this bill.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the principal objections to this legislation—

MR. FROST: Are you not going to agree with us?

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): I hope so.

MR. MACLEOD: —have already been very cogently expressed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown). I simply rise to make a few brief comments on the bill, and I do so in my capacity as a citizen of the City of Toronto and the representative of one of the important constituencies in this area.

Since the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has placed on record the communication received from the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves; I deem it proper that I should place on the record of this Assembly a communication which I received a day or two ago—

MR. FROST: Is this from Mr. Balfour?

MR. MACLEOD: No, I assure you this is not from Mr. Balfour, and that is demonstrated by the fact that the communication is literate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: This is a communication from the City Solicitor of the Corporation of the City of Toronto. I would expect the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) to pay some attention to opinions expressed by the City Solicitor of Toronto, since in this case, he is expressing the considered opinions of the Board of Control, a majority of whose members are Tories. You do not doubt, do you, that the majority of them are Tories?

Well, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, here is the letter, dated March 9, 1949—

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): A majority of four, when there is two and two?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): You have three out of five.

MR. MACLEOD:

"Dear Sir:

"As a member of one of the Toronto Ridings, I am writing to advise you that the Board of Control have instructed me to protest the provisions of Bills 107 and 108, The Fire Departments Act and The Police Act.

"This protest is made mainly because by conditions precedent to grants and by adequacy and efficiency awards, the province is taking away

the control of these bodies from municipal bodies. The Board of Control believes that these bills should not apply to cities, particularly the larger cities, who have had many years of experience in operating fire departments and police departments.

"The protest has been sent to several members of the Cabinet—"

I presume to the Toronto members of the Cabinet—

"—and no doubt many other municipalities will protest if they have an opportunity of examining these bills before they are passed.

"Until the bill referred to in the budget address of the Provincial Treasurer is introduced which will guarantee to municipalities that they will receive from the province just as much in 1949 as they did in 1948, it is impossible to know exactly the financial position.

"While the municipality welcomes the amounts received from the province, which were originally given when the right to collect income tax was suspended, it protests against the loss of control and the vesting of the police control in the Commissioner of Provincial Police and the control of fire departments in the Ontario Fire Marshal.

Yours truly,
J. P. KENT, K.C."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that, I think, can be taken as an expression of the opinion of the democratically elected government of the City of Toronto, which is a rather important part of the Province of Ontario.

After all, you would not have an Attorney-General if it were not for the City of Toronto, and, though that is a sin—

MR. JOLLIFFE: They could get one somewhere else.

MR. MACLEOD: I meant from this crowd over here (indicating).

MR. FROST: How about the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod)?

MR. MACLEOD: Well, I am on this side of the House, and I am not eligible, although I think I could do as well as the present incumbent, probably a little better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: I think it is rather a serious matter when the present government attempts to act in defiance of the carefully considered views of an important organization like the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves and the Corporation of the City of Toronto. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think it is highly improper to rush this bill through the Legislature before the Legislature has had an opportunity to pass judgment on the budget—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: —of which these bills are a part.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: How do you know this government is not going to be defeated tomorrow, when the division comes? After all, you have a revolt in the back concessions over there now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: You have hon. members standing up saying they want all sorts of things, you are not prepared to give them. One of these days, of course, they will have to stand up and be counted. That day may be tomorrow, and you may be out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: It seems to me in those circumstances you should not try to "steamroller" these bills until we have passed final judgment on the fiscal policy outlined by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in his budget speech.

I think the whole story as to the motivation behind the bills has not been told.

AN HON. MEMBER: He smells a rat.

MR. MacLEOD: I think this is a sinister effort on the part of the government to tie the municipalities of the province to the Tory chariot, and I can see very plainly the possibility of this government penalizing a municipality in the province simply because it elects as its chief magistrate someone who does not share the political opinions of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Oh, no.

MR. MacLEOD: It would be a very simple matter—

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh, no.

MR. MacLEOD: —for this government to find out, for instance, there was something defective about the fire-fighting apparatus of the City of Hamilton, or the City of Port Arthur, simply because the chief magistrates of those two cities happen to belong to the CCF, and to start some kind of political scandal, calculated to discredit Reeves or Mayors who do not happen to be Tories.

I can agree up to a point with some of the arguments advanced by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) in support of some of the provisions of this bill. I do not think that anyone in his right senses would object to any effort calculated to raise the standard of our fire departments throughout the province, and to bring our fire-fighting apparatus up to a higher standard.

MR. FROST: That is just what this bill does.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is what it is for.

MR. MacLEOD: Of course these things are very good, but I do not see —and here I agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe)—why that has to be tied to a financial grant. If you call the representatives of the municipalities of the Province of Ontario into a conference with this government and lay before them plans which will serve the purpose—

MR. FROST: May I make a suggestion to my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod)?

MR. MacLEOD: Yes.

MR. FROST: I think I can help him out of his difficulty.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes?

MR. FROST: Just vote for this bill and then vote against the budget, and that will ease your conscience, and you will be all right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: No, my conscience is not like yours, it is not so easily eased.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BLACKWELL: Ever try to ease Mr. Balfour?

MR. MacLEOD: I say, if this government is honest, if this government is honest—

AN HON. MEMBER: Say it again.

MR. MacLEOD: —and is really attempting to achieve some of the laudible purposes included in the argument advanced by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), then they will go about it in an entirely different way, because the municipalities of the Province of Ontario, which in the main are headed and led by very able people, will be the first to agree with any progressive steps that will put our fire-fighting apparatus in better shape. But you have wrapped this up in a device which is calculated to club these people over the head. That is what you are doing there, and you know it perfectly well. Anybody who looks at the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) from the time he came into the House today can see he is upset and agitated about something. He wants to get this through in a hurry, and he is prepared to defy—

AN HON. MEMBER: A recommendation.

MR. MacLEOD: —those organizations which are in a better position to express the sentiments and feelings of the people of the municipalities than he is, because he was never in municipal life before he came in here. He does not know anything about municipal problems at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He is going into it now, though.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, he wants to take it all over.

MR. FROST: Was my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) ever in municipal politics?

MR. MacLEOD: I beg your pardon?

MR. FROST: Were you ever in municipal politics?

MR. MacLEOD: No, but I am not introducing this bill.

MR. FROST: Then what are you talking about?

MR. MacLEOD: I am speaking against it. I am a citizen of a municipality, I pay taxes here, and I do not want the present Attorney-General of this province (Mr. Blackwell) to "steamroller" through this body a piece of legislation, which, in essence, constitutes an attempted seizure of power in the Province of Ontario by the present government. That is what it is, and nobody knows it better than the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). I can tell by the expression on his face.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) might answer this: how is it "seizure of power" to turn to the municipalities and give them this money, give them twice as much money as before—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

MR. FROST: —and take nothing from them, but giving twice as much money?

AN HON. MEMBER: Santa Claus.

MR. FROST: How is that a seizure of power?

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): That is buying power.

MR MacLEOD: If you were not a Presbyterian, you could not possibly stand up and look as innocent as you did when you said that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: You could not do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the proper thing to do here is to refer these bills, both of them, to a Select Committee of this Legislature, which will be empowered to hear representations from the bodies which are vitally concerned with this matter, the Association, the Corporation of the City of Toronto, and others. That can all be done in the next week or ten days, and we can have a full and proper discussion of these measures. The way the order paper is getting loaded down, it is quite obvious we are going to be here until the first of June, or thereabouts. There is lots of time, there is no hurry, and I repeat again, before taking my seat, that the mere fact the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and his colleagues want to rush this bill through this afternoon is the clearest indication that there is something sinister behind it, because the very reasonable request made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and seconded by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) should convince anybody who had a clear conscience that these proposals are reasonable and should be acted upon.

I say you should, for once in your life, admit you are a little ahead of yourself and that you should follow an entirely different procedure and refer this matter to a committee competent to deal with the question—perhaps the Committee on Municipal Law could deal with it, I do not know—if not, set up a special Select Committee on Municipal Affairs to examine these two bills, and let the hon. members of that committee get the benefit of the fuller representations which I am sure the Ontario Association of Mayors and

Reeves would like to make to hon. members of this House.

MR. C. W. COX (L, Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two in connection with this now much-talked of bill. I want to congratulate the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) on the very eloquent plea which he made on behalf of the bill, but I am not so much impressed with his arguments.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nor his eloquence.

MR. COX: Nor his eloquence? The eloquence was very good. The standardization of equipment and the compulsory arbitration to which he rather eloquently referred, though, could all be arranged by negotiation and business methods without adopting a bill of this kind. What I think the municipalities are most apprehensive of, and the mayors, is that this is the "thin edge of the wedge" in taking over the power which properly belongs to the elected representatives of the municipalities.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: I think the record of the municipalities all through the years is one which has set an outstanding example in business administration. I do not think this or any other government conducts its affairs as well as the municipalities. If the municipalities as a whole conducted their affairs with the same degree of business administration as some governments, they would all be bankrupt. I do not think this government should enter into administration of affairs in the municipalities, the government, after all, which is the closest to the people.

There was one clause I would like to speak about, and which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) modified. I would like to know exactly the meaning. The clause itself is very clear and is, I think, the most effective clause in the whole bill and one, of course, which I think has far-reaching detrimental effects. I understood you are modifying that clause, but the language of the bill is quite clear.

In making a computation regarding the expenses, that is, on what basis you will give the 10 per cent. or 15 per cent. with regard to the population of the municipalities, taking the cost of the fire departments:

> "—under Subsection 1, any portion of the cost that is to be raised or paid in any subsequent year, or that is provided for by the issue of debentures, shall not be included."

Now, that is a very, important clause in the bill and one which would have, if it were adopted, I suggest, far-reaching and detrimental effects. I understand the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is amending some part of that bill. Did I understand that correctly? Do I need to elaborate on the effect of such a clause, that your tax rate would either go up or go down if you were to participate in the benefits, having regard to expenditures?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the hon. member (Mr. Cox), I indicated that the intention under the bill was to pay the provincial percentage at the time of purchase and get it over with. Now, if the bill requires any amendment for that purpose, that will be considered.

MR. COX: Then, as I understand that, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Blackwell) mentioned a figure of $50,000—we will use that figure as an example — providing the equipment purchased were to cost $50,000, $5,000 would be paid in the current year and then the municipality would be given the 15 per cent. on the other $45,000?

MR. BLACKWELL: The whole works. Yes, the whole thing.

MR. COX: If debentures were issued?

MR. BLACKWELL: That is right.

MR. COX: Well, that is certainly some concession.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is a

complete concession in that respect, is it not?

MR. COX: Yes, a complete one. If you gave the same concession in regard to the other clauses, everybody would be satisfied.

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh, no. Oh, no.

MR. COX: I just said if you would.

MR. BLACKWELL: No, I am saying if we did, they would not be.

MR. COX: That is a matter of opinion. As I said, I think it is getting in the "thin edge of the wedge." It seems to me the inevitable result of the adoption of this bill is going to increase the cost to the municipalities. The more money you spend, the more you get. What is the natural tendency of councils or any other public body? I think it is admitted that if a large contribution is made by the department, then they are not so reluctant to hold down expenditures.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like in the schools.

MR. COX: Yes, as my hon. friend says, that is what happened in the schools. Here, the department proposes to pay a percentage on the expenditures. I suggest to you the councils will not be so careful as to what the expenditures may be in that department, because, as I said before, the more money they spend the more they will get. In a practical way, perhaps all municipalities will have one very expensive department, an outstanding example of extravagance, because the provincial department is absorbing part of the cost. That will be an example for every other department in the city to follow, and I suggest to you the inevitable result will be, if this bill is put into effect, that the cost of the administration of the municipalities will be bound to go up all along the line.

I agree entirely with what was said by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). It seems to me the mayors of all these municipalities should not be entirely disregarded. After all, they are a very important body. All municipal bodies are. I doubt very much if there is anybody in the department of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell)—he admitted a few moments ago that he had never had any experience in public life—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: —in municipal life. In saying "public life," I am going a little too far. I doubt if his department is as well qualified to administer municipal affairs as are those who are elected for the purpose year in and year out. I think you are going rather far afield when you are suggesting your department should, in effect, take over one department of any municipality.

I agree with what has been said, that I think you would have a moral obligation to bring the mayors around the conference table to discuss with them this very important bill. From one end of the province to the other, people are very much concerned regarding its far-reaching effects.

I do suggest, Mr. Attorney-General, that while no one objects to grants, some other form might be adopted to give the fire and police departments this amount of money, not on a percentage basis but on a grant basis? That would get away from the extravagance which is likely to occur if this form and practice is followed out.

Let me say again in conclusion, sir, that I am of the opinion this will not be in the interests of the municipalities. The cost will inevitably increase. I think you should discuss this bill at a later date and hold a conference with a committee of this House and representatives of all the municipalities in Ontario.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I have some conception of the fears which exist in the minds of a municipality in respect to this Legislature, having served on our council for a number of years. One of the things I am most surprised about in respect to this legislation and the

programme of infringement on the local council, is the very fact that this government should bring in bills which deprive municipalities of local autonomy. For some number of years, the government in Toronto has been telling the people of Ontario how the Federal Government was infringing on their rights and how they stood against this. Notwithstanding this great defense of our provincial atonomy, we now have the government bringing in bills which are deliberately aimed at depriving municipalities of local autonomy. Somewhere along the line it just does not add up.

What is going through the minds of those in municipal office today? The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) says that this measure which has been introduced is of vital national importance, as a national defense measure. I am inclined to think that statement by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is only a "pipe dream" which has occurred to him just recently. Certainly he never gave us any indication at the time he introduced this bill that he considered this legislation vital to the defense of our nation.

On the other hand, if it is as vital as we are given to believe, then I say that it should not be the approach of the government to take over a portion of the cost of administration of fire departments in municipalities. I think what they should do is go to the municipalities and tell them the reasons why it is so essential to have the uniformity of which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) speaks, and explain it thoroughly. After that, they should tell the municipalities, "We are not just paying a portion of the cost of the fire department, we are going to step in and take over the whole cost and we are going to give you adequate fire protection because it is of vital national importance." That would be the proper approach. Of course, we know that is not the fact and this is another deliberate attempt by this government to curb local government as much as possible.

I was informed today that certain sections of this bill, where municipalities do not qualify today, all they have to do is "fall in line." That is what the municipalities are worried about because certain provisos are set out that we must have certain standards of fire protection, and it does not say what those standards should be. There could be unlimited costs put on municipalities through bills like that. The Fire Marshal of a municipality could tell them they have to get this, that, and the other thing, and the cost to municipalities could be terrific. To the extent that we have to have adequate fire protection in our municipalities, I am heartily in accord. I have yet to read any government report in regard to the City of Toronto or the City of Windsor, or any other city, to the effect that the fire-fighting equipment is inadequate, but that is practically what we have been told here today. I think the government should reconsider that very carefully.

I say the legislation, as it has been advanced here today, in this bill is "half-baked" in a lot of ways. It states that we must of necessity, in order to qualify, have a pension scheme providing 5 per cent. of the employees of the municipality, 5 per cent. of their salary is paid and the municipality contributes not less than 5 per cent. My municipality has a pension scheme for firemen, as they have for other civic employees, which was underwritten by the Department of Municipal Affairs in 1935, and now we are told this scheme is not good enough, that it is not adequate to qualify under this bill. That is one thing which has been brought to my attention. I suppose if all the municipalities had an opportunity to study this bill, they would find other clauses just as obnoxious, just as ridiculous as that particular clause. I say again, in my opinion, the bill is "half-baked" and improperly presented and the needs of our municipalities have not been taken into consideration in drafting the bill.

Now, one of the things municipalities are much concerned about is the fact that we have in the Province of Ontario such a large surplus. The government came down with a $25,000,000 surplus last year, and the Federal Government

has indicated they will have a surplus this year of approximately $600,000,000 and yet while this is going on the municipalities have been forced to gradually increase their mill rate. They have had to increase their mill rate to keep up with what we consider a proper municipal administration. Certainly a lot of the reasons why municipal taxes are continuing to be raised are directly attributable back to Toronto. They are not bothering with the things they should do for the municipalities but are "frigging" around with fire departments and police departments. They should do something about education. They should be taking over a greater portion of the cost of social service, which would be equitable and just. There should not be this infringement of local autonomy with the government expecting people to accept these costs. The government should assume some of these costs, but instead they are "frigging" around with this kind of legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ELLIS: They should not be trying to make the financial position of the municipalities that much more difficult. By all means, I agree with the suggestions made here today that this is an attempt to "railroad" this legislation through. Purely and simply, there is a "nigger in the wood-pile." This legislation is not the way we have had it presented to us. There is something deeper than that; there is the taking over of municipalities, and encroachment on municipal rights. I have no doubt, that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), in presenting this bill, is moving along those lines very rapidly. However, I want to assure him he is moving along these lines much against the people who make up our municipal government and much against the taxpayers. This type of legislation will eventually come back on this government in a form which they are not looking forward to.

I agree with the statement made here that for this government to continue legislation along these lines, they are merely sealing their own doom. That, of course, will be most fortunate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ELLIS: If you want to hurry that day along, just keep pitching this kind of legislation at us and at the people of Ontario, and we will know what you are doing.

MR. H. W. WALKER (L Welland): Mr. Speaker, in rising to protest this bill, I do believe it will set up an unfriendly feeling between local bodies. Having had six years' municipal experience myself and being Mayor for two years, I realise the feelings of different bodies, such as public welfare, parks commissions and public health services, in the way subsidies have been coming in the past. It would probably be better for the local governments to administer their own affairs by having these subsidies on a per capita basis and letting the local governments do the job they were elected to do. Some of the remarks made by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) regarding the services for fire protection to the outlying municipalities, I can assure him that most of the municipalities have a friendly co-operation with adjacent municipalities for fire protection. At least in the locality where I live things are well on these lines. The people that elect the local municipal bodies are the same people who elect members to this Assembly, and I think they should be allowed to handle their own local affairs. I do believe that by taking away their authority, we will take away the type of men who will run for municipal office and take away some of the responsibility. Mr. Speaker, this bill will not only divide this House but it will also divide the municipalities against the government as a whole. This bill may have been advanced with good intentions but I believe it will work on the same lines as that of the Provincial Police Act, which gave the municipalities the choice of paying local or provincial police. That has proven itself by the smaller suburban areas when they came into municipal government of larger areas,

it did have its disadvantages by increasing the cost. I do believe the 10 per cent. increase suggested in this bill will, to a greater extent, increase the taxation.

I would suggest that this bill be given more consideration, especially the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves. The circular left on the Opposition's desks, I am quite sure, is very fair, and if a committee, as suggested this afternoon, was formed and these Reeves and Mayors of various places were brought in with the committee it would somewhat relieve the intense situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON: (CCF Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to get all "hot and bothered" about the situation in this House, but I would like to try and point out what I believe are the reasons for protesting this bill. After all, there has been considerable objection to this bill and that is putting it mildly. As mayor of one of the well-known municipalities in this province, I have tried to analyze in my mind why the opposition has come as it has. In order to arrive at a conclusion I have looked back at many of the briefs which the various organizations have presented in days gone by and nowhere in these briefs could I find any expressed desire to have grants given out to police forces or fire departments. There has been a great deal of effort put forward to have assistance in relief; to have assistance for unemployed employables; to have assistance so we could extend our health facilities; have assistance in the field of education. These are the more or less unpredictable expenses which fall on shoulders of municipalities and it is in these fields, over and over again, municipalities have asked for aid.

Last October there was a preliminary meeting of the municipalities and hon. members of the government and, at that time, a Steering Committee was set up and we were given to understand, at least in my part of the country, that early in this year they would meet again. At that time, there were some 11 points brought out in connection with the brief for the Northern Ontario Municipal Association. That delegation, in no case, mentioned police or fire departments. Rural municipalities in this province are waiting for assistance in these fields. Naturally they have asked for assistance over and over again but, so far, no aid has materialized to any great extent.

MR. FROST: Would you say that 25 per cent. to Children's Aid, and 50 per cent. from gasoline tax were not expected?

MR. ROBINSON: It is not what the municipalities expected. If you had come out with some plan for relief of unemployed employables, there would be a sigh of relief across the province.

I do not want to make myself *non-persona gratis* with the government. They have done some good work, but like a bolt from the blue comes this Fire Department Act, which takes us completely by surprise.

I sent copies to my municipal council—

MR. DUNBAR: That was a Christmas present.

MR. ROBINSON: I sent copies to my municipality, and asked them to consider the matter at the council meeting last Monday, and to let me know their reaction as soon as possible, and I received a wire today saying they had had insufficient time to arrive at a decision. I have the wire here in front of me. So the point is really worrying the municipalities, and I can quite understand this great flareup of opposition which has come up today. They cannot understand why these two bills were thrown down in front of them all of a sudden, while the municipalities were striving to decide just what is going on, and I can understand their question of the purpose of the bill. They may be wrong, but while they are questioning the purpose of the bill, it is going through the House. I would plead that the bills be set aside, even at this late moment, and an effort be

made to get representatives from the municipalities together at which these bills could be completely discussed, and if that is done, I feel that much of the feeling will be dispensed with. I do not know whether it can be done or not. I am pointing out—or trying to point out to the government — the atmosphere which has been created in the minds of those called upon to take responsibility for the municipal bodies. I am trying to point out the atmosphere in which we find ourselves. It is of the greatest importance for them to properly assess these bills and figure out where we are going, and whether it is an infringement of municipal autonomy or not. This is a tremendous atmosphere to face any municipality across the province. Even my own municipality cannot give me a definite answer at the moment.

I would ask the government to set this bill aside for a little longer, and get the representatives from the municipalities together, and in so doing, very likely they can approach this question in a perfectly clear atmosphere.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here wondering about the procedure the government is following with regard to these bills, and I confess to an inability to explain the reason for their procedure. I have got the feeling there is some sort of stubbornness on the part of the government to proceed with these bills.

MR. DUNBAR: Like behind the Iron Curtain.

MR. SALSBERG: I have got a feeling they are defying not only the municipalities, but defying their own caucus. I want to address myself for a moment to the supporters of the government, and I do so because I consider this a very serious departure from the established policy of provincial administration, toward municipalities. I want to reason with the back benchers, and reason aloud. Let us see what is what. A bill has been introduced which, as my friend the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has said, should not come up before the budget debate is completed. But having introduced it, it is met with universal objection. That is putting it mildly—

MR. FROST: That is quite wrong. Lots of municipalities have agreed to it.

MR. SALSBERG: The municipalities, through their spokesmen, got together. They brought in the spokesmen of about 40 towns, cities and villages. They approached the government with the request that the bill be amended so as not to infringe on their local autonomy. That was a reasonable proposal. Yet their demands are denied by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell).

MR. BLACKWELL: Vetoed.

MR. SALSBERG: They then asked the matter be not dealt with by the House until they have another opportunity to appear before the entire Cabinet, with the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) present. I ask the hon. members who come from the various parts of the province, whether that is not a reasonable request on the part of representatives of the Mayors to make. I suggest to you, my hon. friends, that regardless of all other issues involved in this bill, there is something alarming in the attitude of a government when it rejects such a modest request, to wait a couple of days. I say, Mr. Speaker, if the Ontario Hotel Keepers' Association were to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to hold up a bill for two days, affecting their business, he would do it without hesitating one moment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is pure nonsense.

MR. SALSBERG: Certainly he can agree to hold back a bill on the request of the Mayors and Reeves of the province.

MR. PORTER: They even laugh at their own jokes, over there.

MR. SALSBERG: I cannot imagine why this defiant policy is pursued.

MR. DUNBAR: Go along; you have good support over there. They are right with you.

MR. SALSBERG: All the interjections come from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) who should be the defender of the municipalities, and who, by the way, always registers the discomfort of the Cabinet. His reactions are always easily read. His temperature goes up very fast, and the quicksilver reaches the uppermost parts of the body, so that all may read it.

MR. DUNBAR: Ask the ex-mayor of Port Arthur what the municipalities did.

MR. SALSBERG: We can judge the Cabinet by the appearance of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar). He is eager to get some of the powers which will accrue to him as a result of these bills.

I think, in the face of the request of the Mayors and the Reeves, which is being defied, that no hon. member can come to any other conclusion but that there are some concealed reasons why the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) brow-beats his caucus—

MR. DUNBAR: Behind the iron curtain.

MR. SALSBERG: —his own caucus; and compels them to support him in a measure they are not in favour of, and to be whipped into line to support him a procedure they know is wrong and unreasonable. It is a defiance that we cannot explain by what is known, and we are justified in suspecting everything and anything.

There are other things to be said about the bill, but I will not say them now. I know there are other speakers who are anxious to get up and speak about this bill at this stage.

I might say that the second bill is very similar, and what cannot be said at the moment can be said when the other bill comes up before the House. But let it be stated that aside from the reasons, we could only suspect—

MR. FROST: You have a very suspecting mind.

MR. SALSBERG: The obvious reasons are not contained in the bill, which should be sufficient to cause this House to reject it, despite the Christmas presents the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) says he is bringing to the municipalities. I say there is something wrong when the recipients of these gifts plead with you not to rush them to their addresses, but to hold back for a while. I say that the Mayor of Toronto, the Mayor of Hamilton, and the mayors and reeves of other municipalities know better what is good for municipal government than the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and the government that is behind him. This bill seeks to foist a police type of administration on the whole province. It is one of the steps in that direction, which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is pursuing. I suggest this is not a matter of secondary importance; it is not just a bill on which we will express our opinion and our position, and be satisfied, and then allow the majority to carry it.

MR. BLACKWELL: At least that is the way it is done here.

MR. SALSBERG: I submit this bill is one of far-reaching significance, and should be fought not only by the opposition, but by all independent thinking members on the government side, in the hope we will succeed in defeating it. It is an unheard of situation. The bill accomplishes more than one thing, from the viewpoint of the government. It puts an end to the one-mill subsidy. It replaces the subsidy with a grant, and that in itself is bad; bad because the government is going back on an arrangement with the municipalities, as I pointed out last night. You borrowed the income tax rights from the municipalities in return for a one-mill grant. You refused to give it back to them,

and you are abolishing the one-mill grant, and through this bill putting the finishing touches to that reneging process. Then, having done that through this bill, you lay your hands —or as the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) said "The heavy hand of this government"—on municipal administration. This is another good reason why the bill should not be passed, and another reason why it should be fought to the last ditch in every part of this House.

MR. BLACKWELL: By every red-blooded Communist.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, by every red-blooded person. Did I hear the word "red" over there? The first thing the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) will do is to bring in a law that there shall be no red blood. I heard the word "red" mentioned. There was a picture of a red Indian in the building, and they put it up in our room. We are very thankful for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, every red-blooded person should take sides with the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves in fighting this iniquitous bill. It is a serious step, which leads to dictatorship—

AN HON. MEMBER: You should know.

MR. SALSBERG: By this government over the municipalities.

AN HON. MEMBER: Were you ever a mayor?

MR. SALSBERG: No, I was not long enough in city council. The constituency of mine elected me to this House, and I, therefore, did not pursue further municipal office after that. Does that satisfy you, my hon. friend? Thank you.

The implication is, I am told, if I had wanted to stay long enough, I could have sought that office. However, I am not responsible for the conclusions you may draw from innocent remarks of mine. You are free to draw any conclusion you may desire.

But I say, Mr. Speaker—and I am not trying to kill time—

MR. PORTER: What are you trying to kill?

MR. SALSBERG: I am trying to emphasize for the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) it is wrong to whip his own caucus into line, and come in here and run rough-shod over the House. I can assure you, Mr. hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that all hon. members on this side who are free, because they have not been browbeaten in your caucus, will continue to battle on this bill as long as humanly possible. You are not disposing of it so hastily, before the Mayors and Reeves have an opportunity to mobilize the other members of their municipal governments, and the citizens of their respective municipalities, to stand up and fight this iniquitous bill which you are trying to force on to the people of the Province of Ontario.

I am sure the other hon. members feel that way, and I am sure you will hear these sentiments expressed in no uncertain terms, and for a longer period than you expect, when you decided on the strategy of "railroading" this bill through, and then the Mayors and Reeves could only try and do something. I think you will hear something more about it.

MR. BLACKWELL: If some other hon. member of the House wishes to speak on the bill, I would ask that he move the adjournment of the debate. If nobody does, I would like to speak on it by way of reply, and I, myself, would move the adjournment of the debate in order that the Legislature can rise, by reason of an arrangement made with the press.

MR. LESLIE E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate. Am I in order to present a notice of motion now?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House I may say the press has a very important function scheduled for tonight, and it has been agreed the House should adjourn at 5.30 in order to assist them in their endeavours. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House, to meet at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. leader of the government (Mr. Frost) indicate the business for tomorrow?

MR. FROST: The arrangement which was made today was to proceed with the budget debate tomorrow afternoon, and close up the debate on the budget, and then we will have a night session to go ahead with bills. We will follow that procedure. We will go ahead tomorrow night with various bills. I may say it is not the present intention to proceed with this particular bill tomorrow night, owing to the fact that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has to be away.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.31 of the clock p.m.

Vol. III, No. 26

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Thursday, March 17, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 17, 1949

Report of Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, Mr. Cathcart 959

Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading 959

College of Art Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading 960

Continuation Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading 960

High Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading 960

Public Libraries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading 960

Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading 961

Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading 961

Teachers' Boards of Reference Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading 961

Schools Sites Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, first reading 961

Change of Name Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, first reading 961

Regulations Act, bill to provide for consolidation, Mr. Blackwell, first reading 962

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, first reading 962

The Companies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, first reading 962

The Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, first reading 962

Resumption of Debate on the Budget, Mr. Park 966

Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1015

Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1032

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1949

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (PC Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Cathcart, from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, presents the following as its fifth report.

The Committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the Township of Kingston."

Bill No. 27, "An Act respecting the Town of Tecumseh."

The Committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 23, "An Act respecting the City of Toronto."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Report agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has expressed a desire to be on the Private Bills Committee, and there is no objection to that from the government. Therefore, I move, seconded by Mr. Blackwell—this is with the consent of the House, of course—that the name of Mr. MacLeod be added to the members of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, is this going to be unanimous?

AN HON. MEMBER: All carried, George.

AN HON. MEMBER: Have you any objection?

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of bills.

BOARDS OF EDUCATION

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) explain the bill?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, the main portions of this bill make the term "Boards of Education" applicable to some of the newly established high school districts. It extends, for instance, the definition "Municipal Board of Education" so it might include that. It is to bring into line some of the practices which have been developing. That, in the main, is what the Act is intended to do.

MR. MILLARD: For the purpose of amalgamation?

MR. PORTER: Yes. There are other provisions, mostly dealing with matters of detail. I do not think I should take up the time of the House now except to say it also provides any city having a population of 100,000 or more may put the question to its elector: "Are you in favour of electing members of the Board of Education by wards?" Under the present Act, that only applies to cities of 200,000 and over, which meant it applied only to the City of Toronto. I think some other cities might desire to make use of this, and that is the intent of that part of the bill.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COLLEGE OF ART

HON. DANA H. PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The College of Art Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. Speaker, this Act merely makes certain amendments to the constitution of the College of Art. The Board of Governors of the College of Art represents certain groups who are interested in commercial art and other aspects of the work that is being done at that college. Some of them have become inactive, and provision is made for substituting representation from other groups in their place.

There are one or two details in connection with the constitution of the college which are covered by this bill.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Continuation Schools Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, deals with certain existing ambiguities in the legislation, which are clarified. It also extends to territorial districts the definition of a "resident pupil," which formerly applied only to counties.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HIGH SCHOOLS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The High Schools Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, could we have an explanation?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for a number of minor amendments, but mainly deals with some changes required to meet the situations arising under the district boards, district area boards, high school district area boards, and situations of that kind. It also makes applicable to territorial districts some of the provisions of the present Act.

There are a great many details in it, and perhaps we could deal with them at a later stage.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. Speaker, this Act regularizes certain arrangements which have been made with school boards who have library boards provide school library service, and enables other arrangements to be made. There are also certain amendments here which will make the Act conform with certain sections of The Municipal Act. It also makes it

clear that, for library purposes, "a police village, township, village or school section" applies, not to the whole district, but to the area served by the library.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also deals with a number of detail matters which have come up in the course of administration of this Act, and also to bring it into conformity with certain changes that have recently been made in the Municipal Act and the Assessment Act. I think that is all I need say at the present stage.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (L Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) give us some indication of the purpose of the Act?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this bill does cover some of the same points which were covered in the bill just introduced to amend The Public Schools Act, deals with certain matters of detail and brings certain aspects of the Act into line with the Assessment Act. That is about all I have to say about that at the present time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TEACHERS' BOARDS OF REFERENCE

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Teachers' Boards of Reference Act, 1946," and the same be now read a first time.

Mr. Speaker, this makes certain rather small amendments to the Teachers' Boards of Reference Act. One point which is covered is that, where the decision of the Board of Reference is in favour of a teacher, the teacher is hereby given full rights of a teacher's tenure, which is not clear under the present legislation. Also, where the decision of the board is that the teacher should have only a limited extension of contract, this fact is clearly stated and the teacher's tenure terminates at the end of that extension, which is not clearly set forth in the present Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SCHOOLS SITES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Schools Sites Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill gives to a town the same right which is now given to a city, to acquire land outside of the town for school purposes.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Forerunners of the Report?

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CHANGE OF NAME ACT

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled

"An Act to amend The Change of Name Act, 1948," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Will that affect the Progressive-Conservatives?

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Blackwell) to explain the bill? I thought he was going to explain it when moving the adoption.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to do that. The provisions under the Change of Name Act provide, in the case of names, the same as the procedure under the Adoption Act. This gives a judge the same powers under this Act as under the Adoption Act to dispense with the consent of the husband or wife, as the case may be, of divorced parents, where they wish—particularly in the case of women—to revert to their maiden name and wish to have the children take either that name or the name of a new husband, under circumstances where there are good reasons for the giving of that consent. There are a number of good reasons for such a thing.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

REGULATIONS ACT

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to provide for the consolidation of the Regulations Filed under the Regulations Act, 1944," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

INSURANCE ACT

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Insurance Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, could we have an explanation of this bill?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the amendment of a number of the sections of the Act, to make clear the definition of "fraternal societies," for one thing, to make sure that definition includes also the dealing with sickness and accident insurance. Also, it amends provisions of the Act in a general way. It permits Ontario incorporated insurance companies to have the same powers under The National Housing Act as those incorporated by the Dominion or outside the province, and also dispenses with the obligation of taking licenses for mortmain by extra provincial corporations under certain circumstances.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE COMPANIES ACT

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Companies Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, could we have a brief explanation, please?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, briefly, that bill is a companion bill to the previous one I introduced. In The Companies Act are certain provisions relating to the investment bars and insurance companies, which require to be correspondingly amended in The Companies Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE REGISTRY ACT

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Registry Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I file an answer to a question standing No. 43 in the name of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) who made an order to return.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to file answers to Questions 3, 5, 19, 24, 38, 39, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58, 60, 63, 80, 89, 91 and 93.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): You are making progress.

MR. FROST: Oh, we are great people to do business. Now, I would like to ask my hon. friend the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) if he would make his question, No. 70, an order for return. I have the answer here, I might say, but it is very lengthy, and I do not think it would be desirable that we should encumber the records of the House with all this information.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): That will be all right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped at this point some good Irishman in the room, such as—

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day. I would like to call the attention of the House to a matter of great importance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PATRICK: This is the day—and may I repeat for the second time for the benefit of the Scotch members—and this is the occasion when Irishmen all over the world are celebrating the anniversary of their famous saint, and patron, St. Patrick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PATRICK: It has been truly said that St. Patrick had no literary ability. However, he did have considerable courage and perseverance, and I think all the hon. members will agree with me when I say that perhaps the closest relationship I can claim to that famous saint is the similarity in names.

I think, also, they will agree with me when I say that at times when acting as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, I have considerable perseverance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PATRICK: Through my veins flows 100 per cent. Irish blood, and I am proud of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PATRICK: However, after three generations in Canada, I have lost the Irish blarney and wit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, and being one of that small but important contingent of Irish-born members of this House, I would like to subscribe to what the hon. member for Middlesex North (Mr. Patrick) has just said. It is unfortunate that he is not on this side of the House, if he is 100 per cent. Irish, because this is where Irishmen naturally belong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: I can only regard the Irishmen on the opposite side of the House as renegades.

I remember back in 1945, the opposite side of the Chamber did have an hon. member who was born in Ireland, but they have lost him since that time, but still have some claim to something Irish,

because the origin of the word "Tory" is of Irish origin. It means "robbers and plunderers."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: Back in the ancient days of Ireland the roads ran through bogs, and the bandits would lie in wait and rob the people passing through. They could very easily escape, as the bogs made difficult ground upon which to pursue them. I may say there is great similarity between the Tories of then and today, in that they are still robbers, but they do it with more finesse today; they make it legal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: As an Irishman I do not want to boast of the achievements of my fellow countrymen. They are very extensive indeed. But I might be excused on this particular day, if we can digress for a moment, to refer to some of the great contributions made throughout the world by Irishmen. I think that all Houses of Parliament, both provincial and federal, from the days of Confederation, have had Irish-born members who have made valuable contributions to the deliberations in the Legislatures, contributions perhaps far out of proportion to their numbers.

I was very much interested over the week-end in reading a book referring to something which I had heard of before. It concerned the period of history in 1848, when nine young Irishmen were convicted of treason and sentenced to be hanged. Queen Victoria commuted the sentences to life imprisonment.

In about the year 1860, one of these young Irishmen was murdered in Canada, and I refer to Thomas D'Arcy McGee, one of the Fathers of Confederation.

In 1871, when another one became Governor-General of Australia—I believe his name was Sir Charles Duffy—Queen Victoria ordered an enquiry to be made as to what became of the others and it was learned that one was the Governor of the State of Montana, two were Brigadier-Generals in the United States Army, one was the Governor-General of Newfoundland, and the other two held important posts. That illustrates in no uncertain manner the flair which Irishmen have for leadership. You should never hang an Irishman—not even in oils.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: Irishmen have, as I say, a great flair for public life and for the military. There may be some other reason for that. I'm inclined to think it perhaps was a case of necessity. The economics needs of the day caused Irish people to give more thought to the cause of those conditions, and the economic needs also forced thousand of young Irishmen into the armies of the world. It was very interesting to note that at the battle of Frontenoy, in 1745, The Irish Brigade of the French Army, won the day.

On the other hand, it has been the Irish who have been carrying England's fight all down through the years.

Mr. Speaker, while I take great satisfaction in mentioning these things to the House, I am much more proud at being a member of this crusading group, which has in it the qualities to unite Irishmen of every stripe, and that is exemplified by the fact that my worthy colleague, the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) came from the County of Cork, which is in the south of Ireland—the deep south—while I came from the north, yet we can stand here shoulder to shoulder fighting for the cause, and I am sure if St. Patrick were alive today he would tell us "Keep up my good works, and banish the snakes."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day as the member for the riding of St. Patrick, I think you should know this is one riding which did not let the Tories down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. REA: Most of you are celebrating the anniversary of St. Patrick today, and you, Mr. Speaker, being a Welshman will possibly understand that he originally came from Wales. I see you nodding your head. But I must say that my ancestors came from Scotland.

At one time there was quite a discussion as to whether the anniversary did come on the 17th of March. A lot of Irishmen thought it came on the 8th of March, and a lot of them thought it came on the 9th, but every Irishmen knew that 8 and 9 made 17, so that is why they celebrate on the 17th.

I hope the little memento the hon. members will find on their desks, will bring them a guide to good living, and open many envelopes of good cheer and good tidings from your ridings, with no complaints.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word in connection with this Irishmen's holiday. You all know that I am one of the most meticulous dressers in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: I like to have my attire conform with any traditional rites which may be observed on certain days, and when I was preparing my wardrobe this morning I chose what I thought was an appropriate tie. After coming here and talking to some Irishmen, I understand that I could not be farther from the appropriate colour if I had chosen any tie on my rack. May I say to the Irishmen here, although politicians should never apologize—I do apologize on this occasion, and I will keep the tie as much hidden as I possibly can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS, Hear, hear.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Well, Mr. Speaker, since the discussion has proceeded thus far, I think we might as well make it a full-scale debate. I do want to be amongst those who desire to greet our Irish compatriots on their great national day. I am sure if the House was sitting on St. Andrew's Day, the Irishmen in this Chamber would be among the first to extend their felicitations to the race of people, of which I feel so proud to be a part.

It is quite true that the Irish people have contributed a great deal to the world's culture, the world's music, and, above all, to the world's good humour. I think it is a fine thing that those of Irish extraction or Irish birth are so well represented in this Legislature. We have them on the government benches in the persons of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). We have them on the front benches on the opposition side, although one of them is not in his seat today. We have them in the middle passages, and we have them in the back concessions, so they are well distributed through the whole House.

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that in this expression of goodwill to the Irish people I am joined by the hon. member for St. Andrew, Mr. O'Salsberg.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I say a word, not on behalf of the Irish, as that is not necessary at all. But in referring to the Irishmen being jovial and enjoying jokes, and always being in good humour, I think there should be some stories told about the Irish.

When my grandfather came from Ireland, where he was a sergeant in the Irish Fusilliers, he settled in Carleton County, and had the distinction of being the first man to be married by an ordained minister.

He used to tell me how the Irish explained things. He said "The first feathered animal he ever saw in America was a porcupine and he and his father and two other dogs, treed

him under the barn floor and shot him with the pitchfork, and had to hit him twice in the same place, where they missed him before, before they killed him."

There was another Irish chap who used to come and visit my father when I was a small boy. He was a farmer down there in the old days, and at that time they used to take a day off now and again and visit with their friends, and he, being Irish, would drive up and spend the afternoon with my father.

He was a fine looking, big fellow, but he did not like to say it himself, and this is how he put it. He said:

> "Tom, my father was the finest looking man in Belfast Fair; he could dance on a soup plate, and you could not see his coat tails waggle, and to see him and me walking down the street, you could not tell which was which."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in order that the Irish may have the day, and may enjoy themselves, we will proceed with another "Donnybrook," by calling Order No. 24.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 24th Order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, as an Irishman speaking on St. Patrick's Day, I hope to make myself a little clearer than the Irishmen to whom the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) referred in his story. It comes as a surprise to me, that the government, led by such names as Kennedy, Kelley, and Daley, on St. Patrick's Day can come in for criticism from any part of this House, but I am afraid that on speaking on this debate, I have to be critical of the government.

Before entering on the main point of my remarks, I again want to ask the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to reconsider his decision on the question of old-age pensions.

In this debate and on the Speech from the Throne debate there has been no opposition member who has failed to indicate support for the proposal that the pension payment be raised to $40 a month immediately.

But of perhaps greater significance, there has not been a single back-bencher on the government side of the House who has been prepared to get up and say that he agrees with the Cabinet in refusing to pay the increase. As a matter of fact the Conservative back-benchers who have discussed the specific issue of old-age pensions have all taken the same view as the hon. members over here—that there should be an increase in the pension immediately.

It's true that they have been held in line by the party. My advice to them is that they should raise the roof in their caucus to squeeze this extra $10 out of the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) for our old-age pensioners. I think, too, they'd better do it right away. With a campaign on for the leadership they have a better bargaining position today than they will have when the new Premier is chosen. This is the time for them to turn on the heat.

We have not had one single logical argument from the Treasury benches as to why the pension should not be increased. Each day their position becomes more ridiculous—and more untenable. Each day of delay in paying the increase will make the Cabinet's eventual retreat more difficult.

I sometimes suspect that the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues are playing politics with this issue. They know the public want an increase in pensions right away. They know, too, that public pressure will in the end compel them to act. I think they actually are denying the old-age pensioners the extra few dollars a month at this time because they'd prefer the credit for the step go to the new Leader rather than to the present hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy).

If any such idea is crossing their minds I think they should be warned that no such political trick will be acceptable to the public. This is the place where the extra money for old-age pensions should be voted and the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) should be ready to bring down the necessary supplementary estimate right away.

I am not going to repeat the arguments which have already been made by hon. members on all sides of the House. I just wish, once more, to add my voice to the demand that the government increase old age pensions to $40 a month, and do it immediately.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my remarks to another department of government. In the Throne Speech debate we had a report from the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) on the affairs of his department, and I want to discuss for a little while the Department of Labour, and some of the experiences I have had with it, and I think some of the experiences of the labour people generally. In offering my suggestions and criticisms to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) I hope he will regard them as being made in all good faith, and in a desire to be helpful to his department.

When a new member with a labour background picks up the estimates that he is to be asked to vote he is struck by the contrast in the amount of money voted and spent by the Department of Agriculture and the amount voted and spent by the Department of Labour. When he has had the opportunity of sitting through the detailed voting of the Agricultural Department estimates—and hears the discussion on the many items—he recognizes that it is essential to the farmers of this province that each and every expenditure be made.

A labour man sitting here for the first time develops a growing admiration for the organizational ability of the farmers of this province that they could so successfully wring that expenditure from the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). A trade unionist sitting here begins to think that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) must have something on the ball.

The Department of Agriculture—aside from the hydro line business which it has now taken over—will spend about $8,000,000—according to the estimates. By contrast the Department of Labour, aside from the payments it makes on Vacations With Pay Credits, which of course it has already collected in stamp purchases, will spend about $1,000,000—really a little less than that. I do not know, relatively speaking, whether that means that the Minister of Labour is only one-eighth as good as the Minister of Agriculture. One thing is certain, however, it is quite clear that the Department of Labour lags far behind the Department of Agriculture in the services it provides to the people of the province.

I suggest to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) that there are additional services which his department could be providing and certainly, some of the services now provided by the department could stand a lot of improving.

One new service I could suggest to the Minister (Mr. Daley). He would be well advised to take a look at the long list of publications issued by the Department of Agriculture, covering various phases of farm life. He would see some popularly presented information about the Department of Agriculture's activities and some of the legislation which it administers.

Then he might take a look at the dull, legalistic efforts of his own department.

Shortly after I was elected I wrote to the Deputy Minister of Labour asking him to send me the various leaflets, pamphlets, acts, etc., published by or issued through the department. I asked also to be placed on the regular mailing list of the department. A few days after I wrote, I received from the Department of Labour a sheaf of publications—most of them were merely reprints of legislation; there were one or two out-dated pieces, one written by the Minister himself. Some of the material was mimeographed. All of it was dull and uninteresting.

If the Department of Labour is intended to promote and protect the interests of the industrial workers in this province, then it should be supplying the workers with popularly written leaflets, pamphlets, booklets setting out their rights, making clear that company intimidation is unlawful; giving guidance on the matter of safety regulations and the Factory Act.

It's not enough to say that's the job of the labour unions. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) doesn't say its the job of the Federation of Agriculture to publish the long list and wide variety of publications emanating from his department.

Organized workers know something of their rights—inadequate as they are under this Conservative Government's labour legislation. The great mass of unorganized workers, however, have little opportunity to learn of their rights. That is one place where the activities of the Department of Labour could be expanded. Let's get the information out to the workers in the province. The Department of Labour should be a source of advice and of information.

I would like to call the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) attention to some leaflets—I will send them over if he would like to see them—published by the New York Bureau of Labour. They are popularly gotten out in the United States and are a great aid to the workers in setting out their rights, and something like that is needed in the Province of Ontario.

The other day we voted the Department of Agriculture $100,000 for this kind of work. In the Labour Department estimates this kind of advertising and educational work is all mixed up with legal fees, administration of justice, witnesses and interpreters—but the whole works is only estimated at $11,000.

Now I know the Minister of Labour —and this government—can have very little to say of itself to the workers of the province—but even I don't rate it quite as low as the Minister does himself in his estimates.

There is another innovation which I feel the Department of Labour might consider and that is the establishing of a women's bureau section in the Department of Labour to pay particular attention to the problems of women in industry and give some guidance and protection for women in meeting these problems.

There are a great many other places where the Department of Labour could stand improving.

Let's take a look at factory inspection, for instance. The Preliminary Economic Survey, compiled by the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, shows 35,412 employers in the province in 1947. Those figures are for employers reporting to the Workmen's Compensation Board only. Of that number of employers reporting to the board, it is a safe estimatae that there are better than 20,000 factories. To inspect those better than 20,000 factories we have a full-time factory inspection branch staff of four or five persons, plus a number of inspectors who do this and other work. The public accounts show four persons employed in the factory inspection branch of the Department of Labour. The estimates this year do not provide for any expansion of service that I can see. Some inspectors in the composite inspection branch do this and other work, but the coverage is inadequate.

I do not know what degree of their time from the composite branch they spend on factories, but in this composite branch there are about 50 or 60.

HON. C. DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, may I say that the composite inspector is actually a factory inspector. He does other work in connection with the hours of work and vacations with pay and minimum wage, but to all intents and purposes he is a factory inspector.

MR. PARK: Yes, he does do work other than factory inspection.

MR. DALEY: While he is in the factory.

MR. PARK: Even assuming he spends 75 per cent. or 80 per cent. on factory inspection, the total number in the composite branch for inspection of 20,000 factories in the province is still a pretty miserable number of inspectors. There would not be more than 60 in the full-time and part-time listed in the Public Accounts for 1948.

MR. DALEY: Actually, Mr. Speaker, we have not any part-time inspectors, they are all full-time.

MR. PARK: I can only read the Public Accounts and that was the impression I got from the accounts. When we come to that section of the estimates, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) would like to explain, I would be pleased to have a report at that time. However, whether you have full-time or part-time inspectors, they are still insufficient to deal with the more than 20,000 factories we have in the Province of Ontario.

Little wonder then that employers in this province can afford to be unconcerned. Little wonder that we have accidents such as that referred to in this House the other day where a young girl lost four fingers—and the matter went improperly investigated by the Department of Labour.

When the Minister (Mr. Daley) dealt with the case he acknowledged that there had been shortcomings in the investigation. I suggest to him a Factory Inspection Branch so small in size—for an industrial province like Ontario, is nothing short of a farce.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I should draw to the hon. member's (Mr. Park) attention that under the acccident prevention group which work in conjunction with the Workmen's Compensation, there are thousands of leaflets.

MR. PARK: There is some work done in that field, but I still think there is more to do.

There are bound to be delays. There are bound to be improperly-investigated cases when you have that kind of situation. I suggest to him that he take a leaf out of the Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. Kennedy) book. Let him look, for instance, at the Agriculture Department estimate for the Agricultural Representative Branch. The comparison may not be altogether approriate, but it is good enough. He will find we voted over three-quarters of a million dollars for this work this year, while the total for our Factory Inspection Branch work is a mere $13,490. There will be something more in the composite inspection branch, but how much of it goes to actual factory inspection is not clear.

The small inspection staff available to the department is an open invitation to unscrupulous employers to ignore and by-pass the provisions of the Factory Act.

The Minister (Mr. Daley) will know, too, that there have been complaints about the delays in the decisions on cases coming before the Labour Relations Board.

There have been occasions when unions have been delayed months from the date of application for certification to the date that they had their case finally disposed of. Part of the trouble there is with the Act—the last one had plenty of opportunities for delay and the present one is even worse in that respect. But again a good part of the trouble is the lack of facilities at the disposal of the Board.

I have had occasion to appear before the Board, and frequently I have sat in on their hearings. I believe that the members of the Board are anxious and desirous of giving speedy attention to matters coming before them. I quite agree with the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), when he says that Board is carried on in a non-political fashion, and I think it is to his credit that this has been done. I willingly congratulate him on that particular aspect of the Board's work.

I do not think the Board has an adequate staff to do the job.

In avoiding disputes on the question of recognition; or on the question of

employer attempts to destroy a union in its early days; the thing that is needed most of all is speed in clearing up all doubt about the rights of the union to speak for the workers in a bargaining unit.

A great deal of industrial dislocation —not the kind that necessarily results in a strike—but the kind that occurs in factories from day to day—could be ended by speedier action by the Board.

I must say that there appears to be somewhat better situation on this score in the recent past. I hope it continues in the future.

MR. DALEY: Would you permit me to make a brief statement? I am sorry to keep interrupting you.

Often applications for certification are not caused by any one group of people. Often the delay can be traced back to some insufficient evidence on the part of organizations by not properly presenting their claims. I would like to say this to the hon. member (Mr. Park) that his criticism will probably be very useful. He has drawn to my attention some things which may be necessary to do, but at no time have I ever refused, and no application from the Labour Relations Board for additional help has ever been turned down. I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Park) will agree, there is no use having people around if there is nothing for them to do and the Board is staffed as the Board requires, and at no time have they ever been refused additional help.

MR. PARK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that a good part of these delays goes back to the Act itself. I am not going to discuss the Labour Code at this time. I want to discuss administrative problems, but a good part of the trouble is to be found in the Act. I am sure there are occasions when, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) says, there are mistakes or errors made or insufficient evidence presented. However, I do believe that the work could be done much more expeditiously if the staff was available at that particular time.

Since I am now saying nice things to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) perhaps I might here put in a good word for the Conciliation Branch of the Department. On the whole, I think the branch does a good job; some conciliation officers are better equipped than others to deal with particular kinds of disputes and to the extent that pressure of work permits them to deal with the kind of situation that they can best handle the Conciliation Service does a pretty good job.

I do not know if I should tell this story but I think I will. On one occasion, I read in the press, a strong attack on his chief conciliation officer by a labour union. On the very same day, a large corporation in this province refused to have him as chairman of an arbitration board because they told me he was nothing but a union man.

MR. DALEY: We expect that.

MR. PARK: I wish I could say the same kind things about the Industry and Labour Board. I regret that I cannot. The Industry and Labour Board is responsible for the administration of some of the most important legislation falling within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour. It administers the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, the Industrial Standards Act, the Apprenticeship Act and the Minimum Wage Act.

To begin with the name—Industry and Labour Board—is a misnomer. The persons named to the Board are in no sense responsible either to industry or to labour. All of them are civil servants who faithfully reflect the attitude of the government in power.

Some rulings of the Board—and in some cases the regulations issued by the Board—have failed to reflect the legislation passed by this House.

The records of the Board—particularly in its administration of the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act—are quite unsatisfactory and inadequate.

A few days ago the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) replied to the question that I had placed on the Order Paper en-

quiring as to how many permits for overtime work had been issued by the Industry and Labour Board. He was able to tell me that there were 1,060 such permits issued in 1948. He could not tell me, however, what was the total number of man hours of overtime represented by the 1,060 permits which the Board had issued. It seems to me that when the Board issues permits to companies to work longer hours than this Legislature feels is advisable, the Board should keep such records as would enable it to know just what kind of condition its permits were creating. It seems to me common sense that when the Board issues an overtime work permit it should require some kind of return from employers indicating how many employees work overtime hours and for how many hours during the period of the permit.

MR. DALEY: What value would it be?

MR. PARK: It would be of value in knowing just how far we were departing from the 48-hour work week or whatever the standard is as set up in the Legislature. As it is now, you say 1,060 firms obtained permits last year. There is no way of telling whether they are firms which employ on an average of 20 people or 120 people or 500 people. It would be of value in finding how far employers are deviating from the desire of the Legislature when they set that 48-hour week. I would suggest that this kind of information should be made available in the records of the Board.

On that score I find the records of the Board particularly bad and I would ask the Minister to see that in future the records are improved. But it is in the matter of rulings that I feel the Board has gone beyond the line set down by the Legislature, when it passed the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act and the amendments which were carried in 1947. Just two points: Section 10(a) of the Regulations issued by the Labour Relations Board permits a company to penalize a worker in terms of reduction in his vacation over and above the penalties provided in the Act itself. Under these Regulations absence from work over and above authorized absence is penalized if it exceeds one day a month by the deduction of one day from the vacation period for each offence. The worker under the Act, is penalized for absenteeism because the pay he receives for his vacation is on a percentage figure of his earnings and any absenteeism will reduce his earnings and thereby reduce his vacation pay. The point is, however, that the Regulation in question clearly violates the intent of the Act passed by this Legislature. While the Board is permitted under the Act to make Regulations, it has been issuing rulings—not contained in regulations—which I feel are at variance with the intent of the Act and are certainly at variance with the explanation of the 1947 amendment given by the Minister of Labour when they were passed by the Legislature. The Board has ruled that employers can deduct payment for statutory holidays and the previous vacation period when ascertaining the total annual earnings of workers on which the vacation pay is computed under the Act. There will be an opportunity under the estimates to go into greater detail, on the matter of these Regulations issued by the Industry and Labour Board violations of the spirit and intent of the Legislature. It is proper at this time to call it to the attention of the Minister (Mr. Daley) and ask that immediate steps be taken to correct this error.

One of the most interesting things about the proposed legislation before this House is that every bill presented effecting labour matters, except for a minor amendment to the Industrial Standards Act, asked in the earlier days of the sessions, has been presented by a member of the opposition. Apparently the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is totally satisfied with the operation of his department. I regret that the labour movement is not so satisfied. Workers are very much disturbed that the government has not enunciated or indicated a labour legislation programme for this session.

We have heard a great deal from the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Black-

well) and others, about depreciated dollars. These same depreciated dollars are to be found in workers pay envelopes. Persons particularly hard hit by the depreciated dollars are those on fixed incomes, such as the recipients of Workmen's Compensation because of disabilities suffered some time ago. There is an immediate need for revision in the rate of payment of Workmen's Compensation and I sincerely regret that the government has not seen fit to present to the House a series of revisions to this Act. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) may be able to argue against the increase of old-age pensions on the ground that they would cost the province money and, therefore, should be avoided as an expense but that argument cannot be made in the case of Workmen's Compensation. The board has large reserves, and its methods of operation insure that it will continue to be in sound financial position. Under the circumstances, therefore, the government in resisting changes in the Workmen's Compensation Act can only be regarded as lacking in concern about disabled workmen and having too great an eagerness to limit compensation costs for industry. The labour movement has asked the Provincial Government to take action both in lifting the percentage payment for compensation and increasing the maximum figure upon which compensation can be paid. The present maximum figure is $2,500 a year and, of course, the percentage payment is 66⅔. It means that the most any workman can get on compensation is about $32 a week. There can be no doubt that maximum wages in industry have risen to a little above $2,500 and the government ought to raise its compensation sites accordingly. The government may not be ready immediately to meet the request of labour in the matter of full compensation payments, but surely it is not too much to ask for an immediate and substantial increase in the percentage of wages available for compensation.

I ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), in conclusion, if he will look into some of the suggestions I have made and I ask him particularly to pay some attention to the Workmen's Compensation Act at this time. On other matters of labour legislation I will save my voice for a later date, but I hope on the administrative matters and the Workmen's Compensation particularly, we might expect some action from the government in the next short while.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. W. FOOTE (PC Durham): Mr. Speaker, I know the House is anxious to wind up the debate on the Budget and I will try not to take more than the portion of time allocated to me. The other speakers, I believe, are the Leaders of the Opposition groups, and I hope they will not think ten minutes of my time is too much, in proportion to what we may have to contribute. I am sorry my guardian angel from York East (Miss MacPhail) is out of the House because she has given me some very good advice. I hope I profit by it. I noticed—I do not know whether the rest of you did—after that one little vote here on a private bill, one of the lights went out up here immediately after that vote. There are eleven left and twelve here. I take that as a measure of tolerance of this great Tory Party. I would point out that all lights across the way are still burning. There is unanimity here and none of that spirit of independence which has been strongly urged upon us by the back-benchers across the way in relation to their opinions in regard to their own programme. They may answer that they are always right, but we beg leave to doubt that. I think there is value in new members speaking in the House on the various occasions that are given to us. In the first place, I feel we come to know each other better because of our exchange of opinions and I feel that it may bring us closer to each other and we may be able to produce better legislation. I hope the opposition will be able to produce more just complaints and a less unsatisfactory type of criticism and give credit to this government for what it has done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: It is not my policy to try to win my place by attacking other people, the CCF or the Communists. They have a right to their own way of thinking and I think that method of attack is stupid and negative. Nevertheless, I will say that our friends across the way made a mistake when they have attacked the back-benchers. They might have left us strictly alone. If the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) had been here, I am sure he would not have permitted the type of language that was used to describe us as "rattling around the back concessions waiting to go up a hill."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend (Mr. Foote) will permit, I would like to make this correction. I could never even think, let alone say, such things about back-benchers on the other side. The reference to "rattling" was to the government and I said, "The government is rattling already in its first session."

MR. FOOTE: In its back-benchers.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I could not possibly say that about back-benchers.

MR. FOOTE: I think if the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) will read *Hansard,* he said—the government and the back-benchers. However, we try to admire people who speak always of the underprivileged and downtrodden. That is a good thing to do and yet you do not carry it out in practise in this House. When you made your recommendations for the leadership you threw the operation of your Party machine in favour of the rich, influential and handsome, and not one word about back-benchers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: I am certainly not aspiring to the leadership and do not want to create uneasiness.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): We know you do not have a chance, that is the reason.

MR. FOOTE: Speaking on the one point of the budget I would like to discuss, I think we would all say most heartily that the hon. Ministers of this government are well worth the salaries as provided by statutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: We are very willing to consent to what is provided for in the statute books but I would protest, in a respectful and kindly way, that those who hang on behind are hanging on a little too far behind and I think the subject of an increase for private members might be discussed in an appropriate committee. I say this—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: I feel there are many good men who would come into public life today and give their whole time to it in a most industrious and intelligent way, if they could pay their own way. However, the present salaries provided make it impossible for a man to give his full time to the work. It is not a matter of getting a good thing out of it, it is a matter of getting the right people to come forward for this service and I suggest that this matter be taken up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: With relation to the municipal bills introduced here this week, I have heard it said in the hall that this was a difficult day or two for the government. I think it is a most interesting week for us in spite of the opposition which has been levelled against the government for its attempt to distribute $6,000,000 instead of $3,000,000. This is evidence that we have tried to give assistance to the municipalities. Now, whether the way we have taken is the one which will be adopted finally remains to be seen

but when I heard of a delegation coming down to meet the Ministers, I did not regard that in the way of a disaster. I felt like thanking God that we lived in a country where people can come down and register a protest and have some hope that their wishes will be respected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: I think that this week should be a significant one for the official opposition. I approve the fierce spirit of independence that our people have against any manner of infringement of their own autonomy. These are not people who will willingly yield to socialism of all means of production and distribution. I believe that they want more the way of life that we sponsor here, and I think there is also a challenge to us to provide along with this adequate security against impoverishment and suffering in old age, adequate hospitalization and a genuine interest in the labour movement which belongs to our system and not to a socialistic system, in my way of thinking.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Foote) wants to be fair, and I would like to see him differentiate between socialistic systems—

MR. FOOTE: Well, if you stay here long enough you may have your prayer answered, but I am interested in dealing with some of the points of opposition that have been raised.

Now, I say this quite frankly—I think they have some good ideas across the way in many things and I think your influence will be felt in as much as it is constructive, but yesterday, it seems to me, that the member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) got himself into somewhat of a frenzy during which he introduced into the debate words meant more for the barracks. I doubt if they are parliamentary. At any rate, they did not worry me, but his objection to part of this "pernicious legislation" is puzzling, that is the pensions paid to employees of the Fire Department.

I thought that that side of the House was more progressive, but he said we had a pension scheme in 1935 good enough for the government then, leave it alone. It is a sign typical of this government that it does not want to stay and live in the past; it is going ahead.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF North Essex): If you will let me question you, I will explain.

MR. J. W. FOOTE: Well, I am reading from *Hansard*. Do you take exception to the statement made?

MR. G. B. ELLIS: Yes, to the interpretation, to the fact that I mentioned, approved plan must be 5 per cent. by the employee and 5 per cent. by the municipality, while the plan of the City of Windsor in the aggregate percentage would be as much, if not more, but the employee pays less than 5 per cent.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, that is all right, you can qualify.

MR. J. W. FOOTE: Here is a significant thing—at any rate, this plan, according to your idea, would not make very much difference, but in your last paragraph you say:

> "I suppose if all the municipalities had an opportunity to study this bill, they would find other clauses just as obnoxious."

Well, if all they find it it that is obnoxious, is that they are to be dealt with on a just basis in regard to pensions, then it may turn out that the objections to this bill are somewhat exaggerated.

I want to speak briefly on education. This budget provides for increased grants to the universities. Acknowledgment has already been made by the hon. member for Ottawa East (L Mr. Chartrand) and hon. member from Huron (Mr. Pryde). There have been similar increases to other universities, and I say this in the most complimentary sense—and I hope it will be taken that way—that we consider the hon. member for Beaches (CCF Mr. Scott)

—who is so critical of the educational system—we consider him to be an outstanding example of what it can accomplish by way of opportunity that is offered in this province today.

The hon. member from York West (CCF Mr. Millard) I think made some very valuable contributions in the way of his comment on the need for Trade Schools, but his criticism is exaggerated. He knows it is, I am sure, when he speaks of the hundreds and hundreds of boys and girls who leave school and do not go on to university. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) knows as well as we do that there are a great many boys and girls, coming from rich families and poor families, who cannot be induced by any means to continue at school or to go to university. I have a great deal of sympathy with these young people because it is difficult to decide what you are going to do, to know what appeals to you, but it is true that many of them leave because they do not want to go on and get any more education. Some of them leave because they are going into the Trades as apprentices, going into offices, banks, etc. Now, I submit that a great many people will go out from school and do not go to university and they make their choice themselves, and in many cases, wisely.

The suggestion about trades schools is a good one, and I think that in time we should have more, but if you view the building of trade schools from the point of view of the tax-payer, I submit that he is not very willing to build a big trade school in his district as long as employers are unable to get apprentices. Now, that is the case in my own community. There are plenty of opportunities for those who want to become apprenticed as carpenters and bricklayers and plumbers, etc. We have been inclined to think the apprentice system has dropped out, but I submit it is more in the change of trades—new trades established, such as automotive mechanics, electricians, etc., that seem to have more appeal than the other trades. I think in time we will have more trade schools, but I would draw to the attention of this House that last year we opened one. We took over Ryerson Institute, and I know many of the people who graduated from that school and have become qualified tradesmen. They need time to get speed and become familiar with varieties of work, but they are able to go out in a position. You used to call a journeyman in the trade, but I think the suggestion we have from across the House is one that would be accepted and I may say, for the information of those who think that this side of the House is always stubborn, that in speaking to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), after the member made that speech, we agreed that there were good ideas in it, and I am sure they are not above asking advice from people who are thoroughly familiar with this type of schools.

In the Department of Health there are many things left to be done, and that is inevitable. Things are not going to be done all at once. One of the pressing needs is a new Ontario hospital, and one is being built at the present time, and I am sure when it is completed, another will be begun. I say this on my own. A suggestion I hope I will have an opportunity of making as I continue in this House among my own colleagues, and it is that we attempt very soon to do something about checking up on the cost of hospitalization. I will go this far with the opposition, that in this realm there is no room for profit, and I think it is inevitable that there be a loss. I do not think the Blue Cross is the solution, and I do wish for myself that that might be taken up before private companies get too far into the field. It is one of the costs that people in the average income bracket cannot stand, and I am sure I am quite within my rights to make that suggestion, and it will be welcomed by our own people.

In the field of welfare, there are leaders of the group across the way—Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Knowles—who say, as we do that this is 100 per cent. the responsibility of the Federal Government, and we say it in this House, and I hope you agree with us. It has been said, and I think by the hon.

member for Bellwoods (LP Mr. McLeod), that this government and its supporters voted against a measure which would provide $40 a month to the old people of this province. Now, I submit that was said in haste because we did not vote against any such bill. This is the only side of the House which could introduce such a bill. We did not have a chance to vote against it, and I say plainly and openly that if I had power to introduce a bill to provide $40 across the board I would do it, and if I had a chance to vote for such a bill I would do it. Now, we have one voice, and I do not expect the government to do what I want them to do—not to be expected at all—there are people there who have been in the business longer than I have, and that is true of other departments. They know this work better than I do. All I ask, and I get that, is the opportunity to express my opinion freely, and that is something that belongs to this side of the House. I have said that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, and so it is. In a way it is our responsibility, too, and we have gone some way towards meeting it. I suggest, from the view point of the government, that there is only one thing more to do and that is for the individual member to take an added responsibility, knowing that there is $10 extra provided, and if he brings these cases to the Minister as they come to him, instead of bringing them into this House to talk about, then they will do more for the old people. At the present time that is the only way we have to help them. You may talk your heads off and it won't do it. I say, I will do it, and since I have come up here I have found two cases of need, and I had them settled in a week. The same courteous treatment is available to every member of the opposition. Nearly everyone in this House—

MR. MILLARD (CCF York West): I would like to ask, did you get the full $10?

MR. FOOTE: Yes, I did.

MR. MILLARD: Better than I do.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Haven't you any in your own constituency getting the full $10?

MR. MILLARD: Not that I know of.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, you had better look around.

MR. FOOTE: I won't be much longer.

Nearly everyone across the way has said something about the liquor question, and I have read in the Temperance Advocate that the three Ministers of this House are expected to speak. This desk has been compared to a pulpit where our voices will be heard throughout the country. Well, the Hon. Speaker (Mr. Davies), is ruled out from expressing his opinion, but I have no hesitation in expressing mine.

However, I remember this, that I am not sent here to produce the kind of legislation which would suit me alone. Now, it does not take me long to make up my mind what I would be satisfied with, but have I any right to bring that legislation before the House?

This is my idea of the liquor question today. If I had my way, I would abolish all sources of outlet for liquor, beer, wine or spirits except through the brewery warehouse and the government liquor store. I do not think that would be a narrow prohibitionist way of doing things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FOOTE: However, that is my own opinion, and it is something I want to give more thought. I realize that for a private member to bring in a bill like that would mean that, although it is not a money bill, it is a bill which would deprive the government of a certain source of revenue. I want to give it more thought, and if I am convinced that would be the best thing to do, I would have no hesitation in bringing in such a bill.

Moreover, I am permitted, and I am in a position to say for the benefit of the

temperance advocates that I would be seconded in this bill by the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer).

In conclusion, I just want to say this, firmly and kindly, that I have appreciated the courtesy which we have received in this House as new members, but will you, please, leave the back-benchers here to make up their own minds? They are not lacking in intelligence or determination, and when we have something to say, let us say it on our "hook," and not at the urging or prompting of the CCF, with whom, although I like them personally, I have no desire to be associated politically.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks on this Budget debate, I want to assure you and the House that I am not going to transgress on the time of the House for any great length of time, because I know we are anxious, I think all of us, to conclude the Budget debate tonight in order that we might have the vote and pass on to other business of the House.

However, I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think in common with every other hon. member in the Legislature, I did enjoy the speech just delivered by my hon. friend for Durham (Mr. Foote). Since coming to this House, those of us who did not know him before, have learned to appreciate the very deep qualities of heart and mind which my hon. friend (Mr. Foote) possesses, and I hope that, as he goes forth on his very worthwhile mission on the other side of the House, that he may draw recruits to his side in order that some of the things we think mean progress in this province may have the stamp of approval of the majority of hon. members of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I want to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Foote) that in most of the things that he advocated this afternoon, I do agree with him, and I think most hon. members on this side of the House agree and most hon. members, perhaps, on the other side of the House, but there is a sort of "officialdom" that stands between our desires and the achievement of those desires.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: It will be the kind of speech which my hon. friend (Mr. Foote) made this afternoon, coming from the side of the House that he occupies, which will help perhaps more than anything else to break down those barriers which exist today between what we want and what we can achieve in regard to legislation.

I want to say, before I proceed to the main two points of my remarks, that I agree wholeheartedly with my hon. friend for Durham (Mr. Foote) in his remarks regarding social service, particularly old-age pensions, but I would differ with him in this respect: my hon. friend (Mr. Foote) said quite plainly that he would "go for" a $40 a month pension "across the board." So would I. So would all of us on this side of the House, and so, perhaps, would a number of you on the other side of the House. Then my hon. friend (Mr. Foote) went on to say that, failing to achieve that goal, the next best thing he could think of was to take the individual pension applications, or whatever you like to call them—

MR. C. H. MILLARD: (CCF York West): Cases.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, "cases," pardon me—to my hon. friend the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). Now, in the first place, he is committed and I am committed to a $40 pension across the board for everybody, not for selected individuals, but for everyone drawing pensions in this province today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: If we are going to follow his suggestion and go to my friend, the Minister of Welfare (Mr.

Goodfellow) with the 50,000 or 60,000 old-age pension cases that are on the books of this province and say to my hon. friend (Mr. Goodfellow): "On each one of these individual cases I want an extra $10," it seems to me it will be a cumbersome method, in the first place and hardly achievable, I think, because we have, as you know, so many old-age pension cases.

Now, I want to say further in regard to what my hon. friend (Mr. Foote) said, I think perhaps we will live to see the day, before we are very much older, that old-age pensions will be primarily, fundamentally and, I would think, altogether a responsibility of the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: I think we are moving in that direction. I think we will see it, those of us who are in the House this afternoon. However, that does not relieve us in this House, and it does not relieve this rich Province of Ontario from doing its full part in an emergency —for that is what it is—when we have behind us the resources with which to do it and the money with which to pay the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: And I say to you further, Mr. Speaker, in regard to old-age pensions, that I believe the day has come in this province when, irrespective of the side of the House we sit on, we must realize that if we are going to make progress, real progress that will last, then we have got to come to the conviction that human needs come first.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: When we are considering legislation, human needs come first, and we should cater to these needs to the level of our ability to cater to those needs. I say further, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come in this province, I think it is past—well, I should not say it is "past," but we should have done it long ago, when we should have taken care of some of our incapacitated persons by way of pension.

I remember when I was Minister of Welfare, we had tentative plans under way, but the electors saw fit to choose others, and we did not have a chance to put them into action, but the time is here when an incapacitated person unable to earn a livelihood and depending for his or her support on the home, on the people in the home, who may very well have all they can carry at the moment, when such persons must be taken care of. To me, it would seem we are subscribing to that doctrine of human needs first, if we move in this direction, in the direction of instituting a pension for those who are incapacitated insofar as earning power is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Furthermore, I want to say in regard to the point raised, by my friend, the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote), in regard to health insurance and hospitalization, a health scheme for our people, I want to say quite frankly that I think my voice was one of the first raised in this House many years ago for a scheme of national health insurance and a hospitalization scheme, because I come from the rural areas of Ontario, and I can tell you instance after instance where sickness has invaded a farmer's home or a worker's home in the town, and when the bill came in for those medical and hospitalization services, a mortgage had to be put on the farm or a mortgage put on the worker's home.

We are asking our people to take too much of the load of the cost of medicine, of the cost of hospitalization and of the cost of services. I hope the day will come, and I hope it will be soon, when we will have a national health insurance scheme for the Dominion of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: It seems to me that would be preferable to any provincial insurance scheme. It seems to me it would serve the purpose for which it is intended much more adequately if it were on a dominion-wide basis, serving all the provinces in a like manner, than it would if we put it into effect in any particular province. However, I am bound to say this, Mr. Speaker, that if there is not forthcoming from the federal arena anything in the nature of a satisfactory health insurance scheme, then I am going to stand in this House and say I am in favour of this province instituting a scheme of its own to do the job which must be done in the interests of humanity and as a tribute to our subscription to human needs first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I want now to deal with only two matters in particular. So far as the Budget of my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) is concerned, I suppose as a financial document there is not much that can be said against it, but there are two or three things which come to mind upon which we might talk for a moment or two.

My hon. friend (Mr. Frost) disclosed this year a surplus of ordinary revenue over expenditure of $1,100,000. Last year the surplus was $25,000,000. In the Budget this year we ploughed $10,000,000 back into the sinking fund for the reduction of the net debt of this province. Now, that is a laudable thing to do in one way of looking at it, and I am not particularly critical of my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) on that matter. However, there is this point to be considered, and I think my hon. friend Mr. Frost) will follow me in it: last year we erected a $25,000,000 surplus. This year we kept our books differently and we had a $1,100,000 surplus. Now, if my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) had the right to put that $10,000,000 into the sinking fund, why not the $1,100,000? Why not put the tail along with the hide?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: If we are going to put $10,000,000 in, the other $1,100,000 you left out is in exactly the same category, and you could well have put the whole thing into the sinking fund of the Province of Ontario.

Now, then, my hon. friend (Mr. Frost)—

MR. FROST: You would leave me a little money, would you not?

MR. OLIVER: Well, on that point, now, you take the general public and those who want to size up the financial position of this province, and let them look at last year's Budget, and then look at this year's Budget. They are kept in two different ways.

MR. FROST: No, that is quite wrong.

MR. OLIVER: I beg your pardon?

MR. FROST: That is quite wrong.

MR. OLIVER: Well, they are kept in two different ways, certainly they are.

MR. FROST: No, no.

MR. OLIVER: This year you kept $10,000,000 in the sinking fund which last year you put into surplus. If you had followed the same plan this year you followed last year you would have easily had a surplus of over $11,000,000.

MR. FROST: No. What we did last year was this: we applied the $25,000,000 surplus all to debt reduction, and that is where the net debt reduction came last year, but what we did this year was this—last year we had to meet the backlog that we applied from Ottawa on the capital that we had spent. There was nothing last year to apply it against, therefore it was a true "Dunning" surplus, if I may put it that way. That was one of the sayings of the hon. Mr. Dunning in his day at Ottawa.

However, this year we had about $40,000,000 capital expenditure and we applied that against it because of the

high cost of doing business these days. You see, there was a difference of doing business last year.

MR. OLIVER: I am not going to argue that, but in my judgment there is a lack of conformity—

MR. MILLARD: Uniformity.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, "uniformity," that is the word I want to use—a lack of uniformity in compiling these accounts and presenting them to the public of this province.

My hon. friend for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) has asked that the Public Accounts Committee be called, and it is going to be called, and I hope out of that committee will come some worthwhile suggestions that we can read into the Audit Act of this province, and we can read into the Act which sets up the various accounts, so that, when we read the financial statement this year and we read it next year we will know what basis these figures are on, and we will be able to appreciate the true position of the province and will be able to understand whether the surplus is a real or fictitious one.

The real reason, of course, why you put the $10,000,000 in the sinking fund was that you found out that $25,000,000 surplus is not a nice thing to have around, with a government holding the mentality that you people do over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: It troubles you. It was a millstone around your neck. You thought this year to find some other way to show the people of the province you were just breaking even, just had $1,100,000 of a surplus over expenditures.

I want to say this further word, we have had a good year financially in the province. We are all ready to agree with that statement, but the good year we have had in this province is but a part of the buoyancy which exists in every other jurisdiction in Canada, including Canada itself. My hon. friend across the way can hardly take credit for the buoyance of revenue which exists in the province at the moment.

MR. FROST: Well, we will settle for 75 per cent. of the credit.

MR. OLIVER: Well, I was going to give you nearly that much. You should have asked for more. I do want to make this point, and I think it is a good point, that after all in this province we have a buoyance of revenue. It is not coming in because of the government. I was going to say it was coming in in spite of them, but that would not be a fair statement—

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Well, it would.

MR. OLIVER: Would it?

MR. NIXON: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: Well, I am advised by counsel that it would be fair to say it was not because of you, but in spite of you—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I do think that is a point well worth bringing up.

I want now to go back a few minutes to my hon. friend the Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), and I want to bring up again—it might be the last chance I will have this session—the fact that the Hope Commission has not yet reported to the House. I brought this matter up in the session and there have been a good many speeches made on it since that time, and I want to try to bring together, if I can, the attitude of the government in regard to these arguments. My hon. friend, the Minister (Mr. Porter) said two things which stood out in my memory. One of them was that we could not reasonably expect this commission to report for a while yet, because in England they had a commission which was sitting for some 20 years.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. I did not say that at all. I did not say we could not expect this

commission to bring out its report because there was some committee sitting in England for 20 years. I merely pointed out that, compared with the four years taken by our commission up to this point, in Great Britain they went into the same sort of problems and it took them 20 years in the way they did it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: With a number of different committees.

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes, I said that. I said that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us not pretend it was one committee.

MR. PORTER: But I never said at any time that we should not anticipate an early report from the Royal Commission merely because in Great Britain they took five times as long. I simply pointed out these things are generally matters that—

MR. MILLARD: You were not just preparing us for another 20-year stretch, were you?

MR. PORTER: Oh, you know perfectly well, nothing of the kind.

MR. OLIVER: I just want to say it is hardly reasonable to suggest that much more time will be required for this commission, when the chairman of the commission on at least two occasions, and the former Premier (Mr. Drew) in this House said quite emphatically that the report was all but completed and would shortly be before the hon. members of the Legislature.

Surely then, it is not necessary on top of those declarations for the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to write to the Chairman of the Royal Commission and tell him there is no hurry, to tell him the problem is large, and even though the chairman said, speaking in Niagara Falls, that he expected the report would be completed by the end of 1947. Notwithstanding that. my friend, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) writes to the chairman of the commission in 1949:

> "Undoubtedly the magnitude of the task of this commission, which has carried on its hearings under your chairmanship, was not fully anticipated at the outset. It would therefore be folly—"

You did not need to tell them it would be "folly"—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER:

> "—to make undue haste towards the completion of a report. I am sure that the best interests of the province will be served by the fullest possible deliberations."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: I would say that again. I was absolutely right, and you know it. You know it.

MR. OLIVER: We are going to have trouble with you, my hon. friend (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: Not very much.

MR. OLIVER: You say you were right in 1949.

MR. FROST: You are always looking for trouble.

MR. OLIVER: I am going to let my good nature get the best of me, and I must not do that, because I am angry this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: But you say you were right in 1949 in writing the chairman and telling him that his task was large and the time was not a serious element.

MR. PORTER: I did not say that.

MR. OLIVER: Well, words to that effect—"you can move forward in further examination of the matters under discussion."

MR. PORTER: Quite right.

MR. OLIVER: And yet, two years before, Mr. Drew and Mr. Hope both said that the evidence was there. What in the world are you starting them out on again for? Have you widened the matters under discussion, under review?

MR. PORTER: It is the first time—

MR. OLIVER: Have you extended their commission? It is the same old commission, the one they said they were through with back in 1947. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Porter), I want to say seriously to you this afternoon that I think you are rendering a great injustice to the people of this province if you do not ask that commission to bring its report in at this session of the Legislature. There is a good deal of opinion rising up in this province to support that contention.

MR. PORTER: Who stirs it up?

MR. OLIVER: I make no apology either to you or to this House or the province for stirring up any commotion that will bring into this House any earlier a report which should long ago have been presented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I say to my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) there is a good deal of evidence that there is public unrest in regard to this matter. I have in my hand an editorial from the *Almonte Gazette*. Now, Almonte is a town in the County of Lanark, and if it is not a Tory paper, it must have a miserable existence, I will say that—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: I want to quote just a paragraph or two from this editorial which says:

> "No, it is not a question of Justice Hope's ability to table a report which seems to be bothering Mr. Oliver and his followers, but rather the question of how long it will take him and his colleagues to do it. With members of the Legislature and people generally panting—"

Get that word in the editorial,

> "—to get a glimpse of the commission's recommendations it recalls the piteous lament of Christopher Columbus' sailors after they had been traversing an uncharted sea for months and feared they would go over the side of the earth, then believed to be square. These poor wretches cried out to the great explorer:
>
> 'What shall we do when hope is gone?' "

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER:

> " 'His word rose like a leaping sword, Sail on and on and on and on'."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Now, wherever my editorial friend got those descriptive words, they fitted the picture admirably, and he concludes the editorial by saying this:

> "And that appears to be what Justice Hope and his colleagues are doing."

And with that sentiment I entirely agree.

MR. PORTER: May I just ask my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) a question?

MR. OLIVER: Well, I guess you can.

MR. PORTER: When this report comes out, will the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) undertake to read it?

MR. OLIVER: To read it?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: Well, perhaps we could take a few evenings off and read it together.

MR. PORTER: It will take more than a few.

MR. OLIVER: I want to bring up another matter in connection with this

report, and to me it is the most serious aspect of all. I have said repeatedly that the failure to bring in this report has led to confusion in the public mind, led to all sorts of wild guesses and opinions as to what was in the report. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) has seen Wednesday's edition of the *Ottawa Evening Journal.* I will send it over after I have completed my remarks if you have not seen it, but—

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): A Tory paper.

MR. OLIVER: Across the top of the *Ottawa Journal* of Wednesday, March 16th:

"New School System for Ontario"

That is a headline in the Tory *Ottawa Journal,* and Mr. Hope's picture, right in a place of prominence, one, by the looks of it, which has not been taken so very long ago.

Now this article I am going to read, Mr. Speaker, appearing in the *Ottawa Evening Journal.* The heading is "Intermediate Plan, Separate School Relief Expected. Hope Commission Report May Not Be Finished Until Autumn." It is by Charles Lynch, staff writer for the *Ottawa Journal,* and is headed, Toronto, March 16th, and it says:

> "Revolutionary changes in Ontario's educational system as well as considerable relief for the Catholic school supporters, are expected here as a result of the four-year inquiry by the Royal Commission on education, headed by Mr. Justice J. A. Hope.
>
> "While the commission's findings may not be concluded until the autumn, it is believed it will recommend that:
>
> "Children will conclude their elementary education at 12 years, leaving public and separate schools after passing grade six.
>
> "From the primary schools they will go into a new school, the intermediate school especially to be established for the adolescent. Boys and girls from 12 to 16 years, the difficult years of their young lives, will complete grades seven and eight, nine and ten in the new schools. Religious instruction of half an hour a day will be permitted, but these new schools will not be under the separate or public school boards but under some authority or board whose setup has to be decided."

Then the article goes on for several columns enumerating and setting out what is purported to be drawn from the report of the chairman of the commission.

MR. FROST: Mr. Lynch knows more than anybody else.

MR. PORTER: There is no authority given for that information—not a word; not a name.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, this brings up the question—

MR. PORTER: It is entirely different from the article read the other night.

MR. OLIVER: This brings up the question that the people will go on guessing.

MR. PORTER: You cannot stop them.

MR. OLIVER: You can stop them by getting the report. They will go on writing inspired articles. You would almost think the report was in this fellow's hands from what he said—

MR. PORTER: It is a different report than the other paper had.

MR. OLIVER: I do not care about the other paper. I have the good, old Journal here, and I am given to understand it is the most authentic. These are the same kind of inspired articles which appeared elsewhere in this province during the month of June last year, and there is the suggestion on my part that this commission will not report until after the next federal election, and we will have a continuation of these inspired articles which almost look to be authentic, and they will be used for the purpose for which they are intended.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), that he could render the greatest service of his career by having this report brought in to this session of this Legislature, tabling it in this House, opening it up so we can read, and I, for one, will be prepared along with other hon. members, to take our stand with regard to the recommendations of the report, when we have the opportunity of seeing it.

There is just one other matter I want to touch upon, as I do not want to leave my hon. friend (the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Jolliffe) until too late in the afternoon.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do not worry about me.

MR. OLIVER: This is going over in your direction. That is the trouble. I have finished across the Chamber now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: I wanted to say just a word—

MR. FROST: You are going to take a "swipe" at him, too.

MR. OLIVER: You just watch. I want to draw the attention of the House to an extract from the speech made by my hon. friend the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Isley) when he spoke here on March 3. He was talking about the farm profits. I hoped to hear from the lips of my hon. friends just what we could expect in the way of farm policy. On page 492 we have the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Isley) saying these words:

> "There is not so much difference from the farming standpoint whether we have a 40-hour week, or a 48-hour week, or a 70-hour week. We still must do our chores, and carry on in the way we did 100 years ago, milking the cows at the same time. So I do not think we should worry too much about the 40-hour week affecting the farmers."

I must say, in regard to that, Mr. Speaker—and I do not want to be unduly critical, because the hon. member (Mr. Isley) is a newcomer in the House—but there is this thought which comes to my mind. He said, further on in the speech, "In order to ensure prosperity you have to keep the pay envelopes of the workers full."

I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Isley) that I have learned—and I think it is a great truth—which has come to me down through the years, that there is no single lane which leads to prosperity's gates. You cannot ensure a stabilized prosperity by insisting that one portion of our population shall be prosperous and their pay envelopes shall be full, and disregarding the rest of the population of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: It is just as much of a truth, my friend (Mr. Isley), to say that you have to keep the farmers' pockets full or labour cannot prosper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: If the buying power of the farmer shrinks as it is shrinking today, then you will suffer in your factories. It works both ways, and I would say to you, and to my hon. friends over there (indicating) that I go a long way in agreeing with some of the sentiments he expressed, but the way to ensure prosperity in this province, and to have a continuation of it for many years to come, is to make sure that those who labour with their hands in the factories, and those who labour with their hands on the farms, have a somewhat even share of prosperity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: If we move in that direction, then there is no doubt in my mind that we will achieve great things indeed.

As for going on milking the cows and doing the chores the way we did 100 years ago while the labour people have a 40-hour week; I just want to say to

my hon. friends that there has been a great revolution on the farms so far as working hours are concerned. We farm in Grey County with two hired men. I remember when I was a boy on the farm we used to get the chores done about 10 o'clock at night, and start about daylight in the morning. Now conditions have changed somewhat. Our men are in the house at 6 o'clock or shortly after every night with their chores around the farm done. Not only do I do that on my farm, but my neighbours are beginning to do it, too. There is no reason why a farmer cannot shorten his hours somewhat over what they used to be, and it is not true to say that conditions which prevailed 100 years ago still prevail in that regard.

I come now to the amendment moved by my friends to the right, and I would say to the House that I regret we have not the opportunity to move an amendment to the Budget ourselves, because I would not have moved this particular type of amendment.

There are two things which I do not particularly like about this amendment. In the first place, it is an over-all amendment, if I may use that term. Furthermore, it insists—and properly so, if you hold that viewpoint—that the province should step out immediately and enter the field of health services and prepaid and subsidized hospitalization plans. What I have to say in that regard is that I doubt if there is enough hospital accommodation in the province to take care of that particular service, if it were put in.

MR. FROST: There is not.

MR. OLIVER: And I want to say to my friends opposite that even if I am not particularly enamored with this amendment to the Budget, I will vote for it, for these reasons:—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Back in 1943 or 1944 some time, the hon. Minister of Health of that day (Mr. Vivian) brought in a Municipal Health Services Act. I was reading last night the great speech he made in piloting that measure through this Legislature. He said at one time:

> "I hope the benefits of this Act will not be confined to the Province of Ontario alone, but that its great benefits might extend to the other provinces of Canada."

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that if there ever was a poor, unworkable piece of legislation on the statute books of this province, it is that Health Service Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: It has never worked, and it will never work either in Ontario or anywhere else, and that has been the contribution of this government toward the expanding need for health services in Ontario.

We are going to go along with this amendment, and hope at the same time that a federal measure will be brought forward which will provide these services on a national scale throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

I want to say as I conclude, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members to my right—

AN HON. MEMBER: To your left.

MR. OLIVER: Not unless I am completely turned around. My hon. friends to my right have said—what shall I say, some rather unkind things about this group during the course of the debate.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF East York): We did not say any unkind things about you.

MR. OLIVER: There was a remark made that we were "democratic capitalists." I do not know whether anybody has analyzed that word completely or not. I do not know how offensive it is, right at the moment—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: It just sounded offensive; that is all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: But the unkindest cut of all came from my good friend, the hon. member from East York (Miss MacPhail) when she said "You are going to be squeezed between Toryism on the one side, and Socialism on the other."

MISS MACPHAIL: I said you could not emulate either one.

MR. OLIVER: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that would be a horrible death indeed, and I would not want to endure the agony which would result from such a restrictive process.

I want to say to my hon. friends on the right that I do think they believe in Socialism. Deep down in their hearts, I think they believe it. But they have had two opportunities to put before the hon. members of this Legislature a number of their ideas by way of amendments to the Speech from the Throne, and now on the Budget. But their amendments were very weak. In fact, I think if we had the framing of them we would have gone a great deal farther ourselves.

I would say to my hon. friends to the right in a kindly way, that you are holding seats just by chance—just by chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: You know your supporters last September—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Not like Welland.

MR. OLIVER: That is quite all right. You mention Welland; I will just tell you something else; we lost 20 ridings in this province by a majority of less than 1,000 votes, and that is fairly close. We lost some others in other parts of the province because the government opposite did not play according to the Queensbury rules.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: These things will come out in the fullness of time, in the progress of our discussions. We are getting around to the place where the reasons are becoming understandable, and when we have solved the problem of how it is done, we will be able to take the necessary corrective measures.

I was going to say to my hon. friends to my right, that back in 1943 you came into this House 34 strong; then came the election of 1945, and you came back 8 strong, and in the dominion election which followed about two weeks later, you did not elect a single member to represent a constituency in this province from one end to the other. Now you have come back here in 1948 with some 21 members. That is all right—

MR. FROST: Less than they had in 1943.

MISS MACPHAIL: I think he is getting mad.

MR. OLIVER: I am not getting mad. I could not get mad at you. I want the position to be set in its proper perspective. My friends to the right came in here with 50,000 votes less than we received in the last general election. I have never complained, but if you look up the figures you will note that you got 50,000 less votes than we did. Yet, by some quirk you obtained a larger number of members than we did. But I say, we can win over here, just as well as we can over there. There is no difference. There is no advantage to be gained by the position my friends hold. There is a disadvantage that will reveal itself more abundantly as the days go on, because the people will expect my friends opposite to put forward in this House those measures which they have talked about so much in Saskatchewan; they will expect my friends to bring into this House measures for the socialization of this, that and the other thing. I want to tell my friends here, you are not elected because of your belief in a Socialist policy, on the 7th of June last, in this province. You were elected because you were opposed to certain things; you were elected in a protest vote, because income taxes were high, the cost of living was high, and because houses were scarce. That is why my friends were elected, not because the people of this province subscribed to the CCF principles or the CCF doctrines.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: We made the grade.

MR. OLIVER: I want to say further, in concluding, this point, I believe we are in this House to make the ultimate benefits for the public of this province. There is the thought—and I hope it is not very soundly held—that we of the Liberal Party are not in favour of reform. I want to say to this House this afternoon, and to the province, that the Liberal Party does stand for reform and advanced legislation, and when we fail to stand for that our reason for existence will have vanished.

There is a great and crying need in this province for a party with principles which appeal to men and women who do not want Toryism on the one hand, and do not want Socialism on the other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I say to you this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that as far as we in this party are concerned, we are going to resist any attempt at a "squeeze" with every ounce of energy we possess. We will make our position felt, and we are going to live up to the traditions of the Liberal Party of this province and in this country. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when we have these things in their proper place, then we can go forward and discuss the various matters on the agenda.

I said a while ago I was going to vote for the amendment to the Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Oliver) was very kind to me, and to the other hon. members of this group. I shall endeavour to be equally kind to him and to the Leader of the government (Mr. Frost), who is to follow me in this debate. I must say we appreciate very much the newly-awakened interest which the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) has shown in the CCF programme. We shall accept the invitation he has extended for more information on the subject, which he is lacking at the moment. However, I can assure the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) that the proposals which have been put forward in this House are part and parcel of that CCF programme which he so frankly confesses he knows nothing about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I do not confess anything of the kind. A politician never confesses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Whatever he may imagine to the contrary, the proposals we have put forward are part of the programme of the Ontario CCF, and the proposals we shall continue to put forward here will be part of the programme of this party in this province as adopted democratically by our party in convention assembled. If my friend from Grey South (Mr. Oliver) would rely for his information on the people of our group, and not on the Tory propagandists who constantly seek to misrepresent us, he would be better informed about the policies of the CCF.

I must say also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I think my friend (Mr. Oliver) was labouring under a misapprehension about the meaning of what was said in this House by the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley). The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) is well aware that there has been a revolution in farming technique during the past century. The point he made, however, was that notwithstanding the great advances in the mechanization and technique which have taken place, to which my hon. friend from Grey South (Mr. Oliver) referred, it is still true that the work to be done on a farm—certainly the work to be done

on a farm operated by one or two men —cannot be confined within the limits of a specific eight-hour shift, or anything of that kind. That is the point the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) was making.

MR. OLIVER: That is not what he said.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is the point he was making. It is very well known to him that modern changes have made it possible for some improvement in working conditions on the farms. As a matter of fact, if my friend the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) will visit the farm of the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) he will find out that many of these changes are being very effectively employed by the hon. member for that constituency.

I want to congratulate the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) on the able presentation of his Budget speech in this House. I am sure it could not have been done more skilfully than it was done by him on March 4. But I am equally sure, that in concluding this debate today, he will be equally skilful in making his points and any defence he has to offer.

MR. PORTER: He needs no defence.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I only have one or two general comments on the hon. Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) Budget. The first is, of course, as I think he will be fair enough to admit, that he has been riding along for the last six years on what is sometimes called "buoyant revenue," and takes credit for his management of that revenue, but he is well aware that all the provincial governments of this country, as well as the Federal Government, have had an easy time in finance, because of the unprecedented conditions of prosperity which have followed the war. And because the province is today sharing with the rest of Canada in the enormous expenditures by the United States Government and Canada, in an attempt to further the reconstruction of Europe.

I suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that he might give some thought, if he has not already done so, to his position today were it not for the so-called "Marshall Plan." I do not think his revenues would have reached the high point they did in recent months, were it not for the tremendous investments which have been made by the American people in the reconstruction of Europe.

Secondly, I want to make the general comment that, whether we like it or not, the Government of Ontario is becoming more and more of a tax collector—as a government. A larger and larger proportion of the revenues being collected by my hon. friend the Treasurer (Mr. Frost) are being distributed to the municipalities to finance services for which the municipalities are primarily responsible. In other words, we no longer have a government which is responsible on the one hand for raising money on the one hand by taxation, and responsible on the other hand for the ways in which that money is spent.

I do not say this in a critical spirit, because I realize that under modern conditions a certain amount of that sort of thing is inevitable.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) realizes, for instance, that the dominion proposals which he asks us to accept go very much further in this way, they asked us to give up certain tax fields entirely and accept a subvention for it. He realizes the difficulty and danger of that sort of thing.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us be correct. I do not think I have ever asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to accept the dominion proposals. What we have said, and said repeatedly, was that we believe a settlement could have been reached by this government with the Dominion Government if there had been a will to agree.

MR. FROST: I want to assure my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) this, that this government is prepared to sit in on a Dominion-Provincial conference at any time, we will go down tomorrow if they call one.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to attend the conference in form, and it is another to negotiate *bona fide* with a view to agreement. However, I must make it absolutely clear that at no time have we said the Government of Ontario should accept the dominion proposals in *toto,* or as they stood. We have never disputed their right to negotiate on these proposals and to put forward alternative schemes.

I am not going to take the time to quoté from the grim warnings of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Rt. Hon. Mr. King and Mr. George Drew about the dangers of one taxing authority raising the money and another one spending it.

MR. FROST: We had them all here last year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, yes, you heard them all here last year, and now they have all been inflicted upon Ottawa once again, but there was, of course, a grain of truth in those sayings. I will just make this comment to the hon. Provincial-Treasurer (Mr. Frost), and I think hon. members of this government should give it serious consideration, that in extending the scope of your financial assistance to the municipalities, as you are proposing to do this year, without relieving them of responsibilities which are more properly your responsibility than their responsibility, you are indeed encouraging a whole new set of problems to arise. I foresee the day when municipal councils will meet and their first consideration will be in considering any proposition, not so much the merits of the proposition, but: "What cut do we get from the Provincial-Treasurer if we adopt this proposal?" I say to you, there is a real danger.

MR. FROST: May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) a question? That raises a very interesting point and one which has, I think, given people interested in municipal taxation concern for a long time back.

At the present time, the municipalities are collecting from real estate taxation about $130,000,000 a year. That is, all the municipalities in Ontario are collecting from taxation on real estate in main about $130,000,000 a year.

Could my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) tell the House now of a tax source which might be given to the municipalities upon which they would have exclusive right themselves, and which they could collect upon themselves? That is a big question.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I am not prepared to do that. I realize it is a big question. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is going at it from the wrong end. What is needed today, as the municipalities themselves have suggested, is that they should be relieved of the responsibility for certain services which are actually provincial in their significance. They have themselves, in the brief I referred to yesterday, drawn particular attention to the social services for which they are now responsible.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) read in the Budget, no doubt, the trend that way and the great list of things which have been taken over, and he must appreciate the fact that tremendous services have been taken over by the Provincial Government which were formerly municipal, and that is the trend.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not want anybody to think I am adopting holus bolus all the arguments the province has put forward in its disputes with the dominion, but let us recall this, and there is a certain validity in this particular argument, let us recall that it was part of your argument at Ottawa that you wanted much more than a new dispensation as to subsidies. You were not content merely to be the recipients of enormous subsidies. You wanted the dominion to take off your shoulders certain responsibilities which you now carry. Now, let us apply that argument here to your relationship with the municipalities. What I am saying is, you do not solve the problem, do not arrive at a satisfactory relationship between the province and the municipality simply by

stepping into almost every municipal field and contributing a million here, a million there, half a million there, and a third of a million there, on certain conditions. What the government is in danger of doing, is, it is in danger of becoming involved in almost every field of municipal administration, which will lead to confusion and which will lead to the day when both the province and the municipalities will have overlapping jurisdictions in many of the services which should be cared for by either one or the other.

I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) realizes there is a problem here, and there is a danger of reaching the point where, as I say, municipal councils will meet and instead of examining the merits of a problem, instead of considering its relative value to the people of their municipality, their first and paramount question is going to be: "What is our cut from the Provincial Treasurer?" I say that is an unsound approach to municipal administration, and the temptation will be, of course, to embark on the proposals where they appear to get the biggest "pay-off" from the Provincial Treasurer and avoid those where they are going to get the least assistance from the Provincial Treasurer, and in that particular municipality that may be an entirely false standard of values, and one which should not for a moment be applied.

In any event, the government undertakes now to go much further than any Ontario Government has ever gone by way of financial assistance to the municipalities. Now, they need it, we all know, but we believe the government is putting the emphasis on the wrong place, and I will indicate shortly where we think the emphasis ought to be put. Before I go any further, and having said how well I thought the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) presented his speech on the 4th of March, I know he will not object if I say we are very much dissatisfied with the form in which the estimates are presented this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I agree wholeheartedly with what was said about this by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). Perhaps the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has not had time to edit his estimates. I would suggest that he should get an editor, as from an editorial point of view, they are in very bad shape. Let me give two examples.

As I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) pointed out, the way in which certain figures are placed in the statutory column and others in the column to be voted, is entirely illogical and irrational. In some departments we find the only figure in the statutory column is the minister's salary, and we know, of course, that that is traceable to the Executive Council Act.

MR. FROST: I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) this, that those items, those so-called "statutory" items—

MR. JOLLIFFE: "So-called" is right.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Are they, or are they not?

MR. FROST: Yes, they are statutory items, but, Mr. Speaker, we are not to blame for them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Nixon), opposite had most to do with creating statutory items. I would like to have all items voted myself.

MR. NIXON: I may say I agree with you on that.

MR. FROST: But let me say this, and I know my hon. friend. the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has discussed this with me on many occasions; take one of our greatest expenditures, that of highways, is a statutory item and it is because of the old Highway Improvement Act of years ago, which was passed when my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) was a member of the Farmers' Government in this House nearly thirty years ago. Now, that has been a statutory item ever since.

MR. NIXON: Why have you not changed it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did you not?

MR. FROST: Why did you not change it? You were here nine years.

MR. NIXON: I will change it the very first time I am back on the treasury benches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that may then go on for years and years, because we expect to be here for another twenty years.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, the position is even worse than was indicated by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Oh, do not make it any worse.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Not only do you have some figures in the statutory column which I think should not be there, but you also have some utterly fantastic items in, for example, the Department of Agriculture—I am not quarrelling with the way it was done, but if you look at page 8 of the Estimates, for example, you will find "Grants to Agricultural Societies" under section 24, subsections 1 (a) to (d) inclusive, of The Agricultural Societies Act are listed in the column to be voted. Here, in other words, you have a specific reference to the section, subsection and clause of the Act under which the money is appropriated, and it is listed to be voted. I do not mind voting it, we all voted for this particular item but it cannot possibly be logical or systematic that in some departments, as in Agriculture, almost nothing except the minister's salary appears in the statutory column, while over in the Department of Highways, all manner of odds and ends appear in the statutory column.

The second serious difficulty is this, that where reference is made to the statute authorizing the expenditure, in some departments, the statute and the particular section is mentioned, in others there is no mention of them at all. I cannot find any fault with the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the hon. Attorney-General, or the Department of Education. I think that in education, my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) has meticulously written in all the sections and subsections I could trace.

MR. PORTER: Absolutely.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, this is one of the few occasions on which we can congratulate and commend the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter). However, some of the other hon. members of the government have been extremely careless about the estimates which they undertook to pilot through this House and I am afraid the Department of Highways is certainly one of the worst examples.

I would suggest that in preparing further estimates, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) or his editor, scrutinize every item to be sure it will be clear, precise and, in the case of statutory authority, that the statute itself and the relevant section and subsection should be mentioned, as was done in some departments this year.

The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is here, and while I will only be two or three minutes on the subject, I cannot conclude this debate in which he has taken part without correcting one or two misapprehensions under which he seems to be functioning. In speaking in this debate on the 10th of March, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) referred to the proportion of university costs borne by the students of our university, by the undergraduate; and at page 716 of *Hansard* he is quoted as giving the percentage at the University of Toronto as "42.51 per cent." I think that is a significant figure, and I wish the public of Ontario all knew that the proportion is that high. I wish they all knew that, in theory at least, 42.51 per cent. of the cost of operating the University of Toronto is borne by the undergraduates. The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) gave even higher figures for Western University, 46.68 per cent., Queen's University, 51.52 per cent.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) then

went on to suggest that in many cases this is made possible by the work done by undergraduates, by students, and I think he commended it. That is very true, they do raise a little money in that way, but it would be far more true to have said that these costs are actually being paid by the parents of most of these undergraduates and that is the really significant point. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the parents of young people attending university, a relatively small section of the taxpayers, are called on to pay nearly half the costs of maintaining our universities.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) may think this a good thing, but what is the result? The practical result is that, more and more, those attending universities, now that the D.V.A. allowances are coming to an end, are being narrowed down to the sons and daughters of those who can afford to bear this very heavy burden.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) seemed to be very—well, I do not want to be offensive about it, but I was a little shocked by the way in which he discussed this subject; the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) seemed to be complacent about it. He seemed to be not unduly distressed that this enormous contribution to the educational needs of this province is being made by relatively few people, obviously the few who can afford to pay.

Just to show little right to complacency there is in this rich and fortunate province I will draw to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) a statement which probably was given the same day the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) spoke in this House, by the President of the University of Western Ontario. I regard this statement as so important that I will take the time to read it to the House. It appeared on the front page of the *Globe and Mail* of Saturday, March 12th. It is dated from London, Ontario, March 11th, under the byline of William French. I hope this will be carefully followed so that my hon. friends may see how the university grants of this province compare with the university grants in Britain.

MR. PORTER: I have read it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then I will read it to those who have not yet heard it.

It says:

> "Sweeping changes in the methods of financing university education in Canada were advocated today by President G. Edward Hall of the University of Western Ontario."

MR. FROST: Mr, Speaker, may I say to my friend I know he is not losing sight of this fact, that in Great Britain the grants to universities are made by a central government. Our difficulty here is that our grants are made by the provincial governments.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will deal with that question. If my friend will just be seated and discuss the matter when his turn comes, I will deal with it now. As a matter of fact, Doctor Hall makes it quite clear.

> "Dr. Hall, one of Canada's top research scientists during the war, expressed grave fears for the immediate future of Canadian universities, especially the four major private non-denominational colleges——Dalhousie, McGill, Queen's and Western—unless the present system of financing is changed.
>
> "Dr. Hall, at 41, one of the youngest college heads in Canada, recommended a system of increased government grants administered by an independent body such as the University Grants Committee in Great Britain. This body would thoroughly survey the needs of every university in each province, then ask the Provincial Treasurer for the money needed.
>
> He visualized the time in the very near future when, under the present system, university fees will have to be raised so high to meet expenditures that higher education will be the privilege only of the wealthy.

"'The next three years,' Dr. Hall said, 'can be the most critical period in the history of Canadian universities.'

"Dr. Hall pointed out that in 1925, when Western had 690 students, the Provincial Government grant was $300,000 and met 66 per cent. of revenue needed. Last year, with 4,600 students, the grant was $350,000, only 29 per cent. of the money needed."

MR. FROST: Let me say to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe)—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just a minute. Let me finish this report. Let us not chop it up into little pieces.

He goes on to say:

"'The great burden of meeting current revenue,' he continued, 'is passed on to increased student fees. With fees going up and up and up, we're making university education available only for those who can afford it. It is becoming exclusive, when it should be a privilege available for all capable of receiving it.'

"Dr. Hall stated that educators are being denied the opportunity of giving leadership in education. 'The presidents, deans and other officials in our universities,' he said, 'have had to forsake education to become executives, super-salesmen, leaders of delegations and beggars, so that universities may even remain in existence. In doing so, they are neglecting the responsible leadership which is their duty.'

"Comparing the Canadian system with that in Britain, Dr. Hall pointed out that last year the British Government earmarked $70,000,000 for educational purposes, with no strings attached and no state control. This is an average of about $760 for each of the 60,000 students for the year.

"In Ontario, the average was $150 per student—$3,750,000 for about 28,000 students. Over and above the grants in Britain, 68 per cent. of the British students are in government or university scholarships.

"The University Grants Commission which Dr. Hall advocates here is a group composed now of 16 educators. It was established in 1921, and is completely divorced from politics. Each of the 27 major universities in Great Britain is visited every five years and the committee makes a thorough study of its needs.

"The committee presents its bill directly to the Treasury, not through the Ministry of Education, and distributes the funds on a five-year basis after consultation with the various universities. It has the power to recommend changes in the curriculum and to finance the changes, to prevent any university from becoming top-heavy in any one branch.

"'Such a committee here,' Dr. Hall said, 'would go around to the universities, to study their needs and resources. It would look into the future, see where we duplicate, and where we spread too thin. It would put universities' financing on a long-term basis of continuity, not on the present year-to-year basis of expediency'."

MR. FROST: May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) if he thinks that system would work here in the Province of Ontario?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I believe the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has in mind that in this country, unlike Britain, we have provincial governments, as well as a central government. The point is not a valid point because in this country not only your taxing powers, but your responsibilities are divided. It is true the British central government has unlimited taxing power, from which it is able to make these grants for universities, but it is also true that in this country the Province of Ontario does not have the same responsibility which the central government has in Britain. For instance, you have no responsibility for the cost of defence, and you have also accepted—and nobody has suggested you should give it up—the principle that education is a provincial responsibility.

MR. FROST: Do you think it would be good business for a council of university heads in this province to get together, say, in the month of January, 1949, and say "We want this much money," and send down a bill to the Provincial Treasurer saying, "This is the money we want"? Suppose this year they said "We want $15,000,000." Does my friend thing that could be worked satisfactorily with a direct taxation system, such as we have? Does my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) think for a moment it is possible?

I want to get my friend straight on this point—

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am quite straight. I am quoting from somebody who knows far more about the universities of this country than you do. You do not need to put me straight.

MR. FROST: In connection with Western University; when this government came into office in 1943, the grant to universities was $265,000 per year. Insofar as I am aware, the Government of Ontario has never made a grant to Western University. Since this government came into power, we have increased the grants until today they amount to $375,000 for maintenance—

MR. JOLLIFFE: This year?

MR. FROST: It was $350,000 previous to that. In addition to that, may I say to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) that we have granted to Western University, in capital grants, $875,000 in the same period of time. That is a tremendous difference over the past.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us not become confused between maintenance grants and capital grants. The subject which Dr. Hall was discussing was the system of grants, as the result of which each student in Britain was subsidized to an average which is mentioned in this article, of $760 per student. You are subsidizing your university students for cost purposes, an average of $150. That is a very sharp and startling comparison.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask—

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not yield the floor to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: I am not insisting. I just wanted to ask a question.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will have the floor until I finish making my point.

I know the point of view of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter). He expressed it on March 10th, that the benefits should be paid for, in part at least, by the immediate beneficiaries of this education. There is an element of truth in that, but at the same time I suggest the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) should be putting the emphasis on the other foot. No country today can afford to be without trained leadership in all the arts and sciences.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is in the national interest and in the provincial interest, that we have schools of higher education in this province, and that is where the emphasis ought to be. If you are going to put the emphasis there, and subsidize that kind of education, then you can probably be sure that you will get the best results, which will enable the people who are capable of receiving that training to go to the universities, rather than the group who may happen to be able to go because their parents are able to bear 40 per cent. or more of the cost of these costly institutions.

Now, what is the question the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) wished to ask?

MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) suggest we should have given a greater maintenance grant to Western University than we are providing for them this year?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, what I have been suggesting is that you ought to be reviewing and reconsidering your whole scheme of university grants.

MR. PORTER: We are; we are. I am asking the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) whether he is criticizing the

amount allotted and appropriated for Western University in the present Budget?

MR. JOLLIFFE: They must be divided equitably as between the different universities. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is trying to get me to say Western should have more, so that he can come back at a later day and say that I was favouring Western University.

MR. PORTER: No. What about the appropriation for Western? Is it enough, or not enough?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I say the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) has no right to sit in this House and be as complacent as he was last week about our universities, until such time as the figures for assistance to the univerities of this province can compare with those in Britain. Then he can have something to boast about.

MR. PORTER: I can show the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) that they do compare right now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You did not say so in your speech last week.

MR. PORTER: I was not talking about Britain, and nobody else was. My question is, are you criticizing the amount appropriated for Western University?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Obviously the amount appropriated for the universities is inadequate—including Western University—to enable higher education to flourish in Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, may we call it 6 o'clock, and we can continue after the recess, and perhaps the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) can think up a better question in the interval.

MR. PORTER: I might figure out a question you can answer.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6 of the clock, I do now leave the Chair.

It being 6 of the clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock this evening, I was putting forward the point which had been made clear by Dr. Hall, the President of the University of Western Ontario, that in Ontario we are subsidizing our universities on an average of $150 per student, while in Britain the British Government is subsidizing university training to the tune of an average of $760 for each student. I was suggesting—

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) knows there are very, very many less undergraduates at the English universities than there are here.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will agree with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) that there are many less undergraduates at the English universities than there are here. That may be so on a per capita basis, but the difference is not as great as he may imagine. According to Dr. Hall, there were last year, I belive, 28,000 university students in Ontario and in Britain there were 60,000. I will agree with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) that we have more in our universities per capita than they have in Britain.

HON. MR. PORTER: Very much more.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, considerably more than they have over there, but they are putting the emphasis in the place where I suggest it should be. They are providing university training for the people most capable of receiving that training and they will probably get better results in that way than we are by having more students at the universities, many of whom, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) knows, are not as capable as they should be of absorbing university training.

I would also underline a further point made by Dr. Hall that in addition to the

assistance which has been mentioned, over and above the grants made to the universities, 68 per cent. of the British students are on government or university scholarships. I may say that is a substantial increase from the percentage when I was myself a student in Britain, and it is very much to the credit of the British Government.

I am not suggesting that in one leap the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) could attain the British standards in this regard, but I do say that with the revenues what they are today, with the potentialities of this province what they are today, we ought to have made by this time more progress than we have made. The tragedy of it is, Mr. Speaker, that the period in which our universities have been largely attended by young men from the Services on D.V.A. allowances is coming to an end, and as it comes to an end, thta group of young men, most of whom I think were hard workers and did their utmost to live up to their opportunities at our universities, at the end of that group of young men we are in a new period in which the majority of university students will be at the universities really because their parents are in a position to bear the costs which are higher than ever before.

I may say—if you will pardon me striking a personal note—I do not think I could have gone to university if the cost in my day had been as high as they are today. And, I think also, in fact I know, better men than I are not able to go today because tuition fees and living costs are so high and their parents do not have the resources to assist them. Better men than I and even, perhaps, better men than the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter)—

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: (LP Bellwoods) : Impossible.

HON. MR. PORTER: Thank you.

MR. JOLLIFFE:—Will be denied the opportunity of education because we have allowed the cost to get beyond the limit of the working man or farmer.

I may say, too, my father attended one of the Colleges which was affiliated with the University of Toronto, and the great majority of the men in his year, like himself, were sons of farmers. If you go to that same college today you will find a very, very small minority in any year are sons of farmers or, for that matter, sons of working men.

I thought the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) was a little less than fair in his references to the British Committees which investigated education over a period of years. I suggest they were in no way comparable or analagous to the Royal Commission on Education which has been functioning in this province since March, 1945.

These Committees—the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) did make that clear—not one Committee, but a number of Committees, extended over a great many years and went into the subject of education under varying terms and references. I think the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) will agree the first of them got to work shortly after the First World War when Mr. Lloyd George or Mr. Bonar Law was Prime Minister. However, the committees continued their exploratory work and investigations in the life of several different parliaments, under several different governments. The end result was a new Education Act in 1944. But, I think it is not fair to compare the different committees set up by different governments over a period of years, with the work of a Commission on Education, which we were told in 1945, would have the broadest terms of reference and would bring back the answer to the problems besetting the hon. Minister of Education of that time. Certainly, to judge by the statement of the Chairman of the Commission for the last two or three years and to judge by statements made at the outset, there was no thought that the delivery of the report would be postponed as long as it has been. Now, I suppose we shall be lucky if we get a report by its fifth birthday. We are not getting it by its fourth birthday which will be on Monday next, and which, as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) has said, deserves a celebration.

Now, there is one more thing I do want to say to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) before I leave this question and that is, and I say this sincerely, that there is a feeling, not only on these benches, but also among educationists throughout the province, that this subject is so important and such a big subject that it deserves the attention of a full-time Minister. If the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) does not agree with me, he is at liberty to say so. The fact is, for years now, educationists have been complaining that this department suffered by reason of having a part-time Minister. Many of us were much disappointed that when the present Minister (Mr. Porter) was appointed to this Portfolio, he carried with it other responsibilities. Perhaps they are light responsibilities, but it seems to us it would be much better to have a full-time Minister giving it his undivided attention.

Might I say, to give one example of how the educationists feel, the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation met at a convention in Toronto at the end of the year and were reported thus in the *Globe and Mail* of December 31st, according to the second last paragraph of the report:

> "Education is of sufficient importance to warrant a full-time cabinet minister, in the opinion of the federation. In a resolution adopted at the final session of their annual meeting yesterday, the federation voiced disappointment over the practice which finds the Minister of Education holding two portfolios."

I would, however, give the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) this brief tribute as I leave the subject, that I think, on the whole, he is taking the job more seriously than his predecessor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I bring this speech to a conclusion, I am obliged to return once again to the question of our welfare services. What I have to say about them will be brief. Some references have been made in this debate to the record of our old-age pensions in Ontario. I think, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) will find, if they check their records, what actually happened was this, that until July 1, 1943, the $20 old-age pension was in effect and on July 1, 1943, while my friend from Brant (Mr. Nixon) was Premier, a 15 per cent. provincial bonus became effective to raise the maximum pension to $23. In August, 1943, the Dominion Government passed an Order-in-Council approving a $5 war-time bonus.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Does my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) have the date of that Order-in-Council?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I do not have the exact date of the Order-in-Council. I am informed that it was passed in that month, the cost to be shared by the provinces.

On November 1, 1943, this $5 war-time bonus became effective in Ontario, as I understand it, because Ontario agreed to participate, making the maximum pension as of November 1, 1943, $28.

On May 1, or June 1, 1947—I am not certain which, a $30 pension became effective through new Dominion Legislation, replacing the previous bonuses.

And, on July 1, or August 1, 1947, an additional $10 provincial supplement became effective, where the need could be established, I think the expression was, making a maximum pension of $40.

Now, I put that on the record because I am quite certain it is correct and I think we should know what the chronology of the thing has been. I would next draw the attention of the House to another record, and that is the record as shown by the Dominion Government official cost-of-living index. When I turn to the year 1943, when the first supplements went into effect on the old $20 pension, we find in the year 1943 the average cost-of-living index was 118.4, it was only 18½ points above the level at the beginning of the war. Of course, it continued at a $28 maximum from November 1, 1943, until July or August, 1947. Now, in

that period from 1943 to 1947, the cost-of-living index rose from 118.4 to 135.9 on the 1st day of July, 1947. I suppose it was in some small acknowledgment of this change in the situation that the province announced the $10 provincial settlement in case of need. The assumption was that it would be granted to a great many people, but we all know now that it was granted to a very small fraction of the total. However, the cost of living has gone up with respect to all old-age pensioners, not merely to 1 or 2, or 3 or 4 or 5 per cent. The increase in the cost of living rose as shown in the index, from 118.4 to 135.9 in those years. It affected all the old-age pensioners without exception. Of course, since 1947, due to the relaxation of controls, the cost of living has gone still higher, and it is today in the neighbourhood of 159, so that the contrast between the two chronologies is this:

While in 1943 the bonus in the first part of the year was $20.00 and in the latter part of the year $28.00, the cost-of-living index 118.4, we now find the cost-of-living index at 159, and now the old-age pensioners get a maximum of $40.00 a month, an average far below $40.00 and not very much above $30.00.

Now these two simply do not fit, and I again appeal to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and I appeal to him, I can say this sincerely and seriously, I appeal to him on a non-partisan basis and, if you want to put it that way, on a non-political basis. I appeal to him not only on behalf of the old-age pensioners of this province, but on behalf of hundreds of thousands of people of all political faith, who believe old-age pensioners ought to be compensated for the great increase in the cost of living in the last 2 or 3 years. In real money, Mr. Speaker the government is paying old-age pensioners very much less than they did 2 or 3 years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Their purchasing power is less than it was, and to them at least, Mr. Speaker, it is no joke.

Now, we were interested in a reference made at an earlier date to retrenchment. We do not see many signs of retrenchment in the hon. Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) Budget, not very many.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): He is going to take a new angle now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Except in regard to old-age pensioners.

MR. FROST: There is no retrenchment there.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, there is. You are paying them less than you did 2 or 3 years ago.

MR. FROST: That is true of everybody.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not true of everybody.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Not Cabinet Ministers.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I did not like to mention that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is a mere $2,000?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then I would remind the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) while he is prepared to assist municipalities with road work, with their Fire Department and their Police Departments, he has not gone very far in assisting them to improve their social service problems. I know something is being done, I am aware that some assistance is going to be given in setting up old people's homes and the Children's Aid Society, but what we ought to be doing is relieving the municipalities of the heavy burden that they now carry, and it is considerable for their welfare services. I think I am correct in saying, at the present time municipalities are responsible for 100 per cent. of the cost of unemployed employables; they are responsible for 50 per

cent. of the cost of unemployed unemployables, 100 per cent. of the cost of the Children's Aid Society wards. You are taking a step in the right direction this year for which I give the government credit, in contributing something toward the cost of maintaining Children's Aid Society wards. The municipalities are responsible for 100 per cent. of the cost of maintaining indigent patients in hospitals, apart from the per diem grant which the Provincial Government makes. I know there are per diem grants, which I believe are $3.00 for class "A" hospitals; $2.50 for class "B"; $2.00 for class "C," but apart from that, a number of municipalities have had to assist their hospitals because somebody had to pay the deficiency caused by looking after indigent patients from outside the municipality.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I might say with the new system of grants introduced here last year and, which I am glad to say. the hon. members of my hon. friend's (Mr. Jolliffe) group voted with us to put that legislation into effect—

MR. JOLLIFFE: We will vote with you when you do the right thing.

MR. FROST: I am talking about hospital tax.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Oh, oh, do not bring that up.

MR. FROST: Our survey shows there should be no more hospital deficit in Ontario, and we substantially assisted some municipalities, notably Toronto, to which we gave $300,000 this year to clear that situation up.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I appreciate the assistance. I think more assistance than ever before has been given our hospitals, but I do not think the government should forget that many hospital boards in many parts of Ontario have had trouble with indigents and in some cases indigents from unorganized areas for which they had no responsibility at all. I suggest for them that the province has complete responsibility.

And, then, to add to this long list of municipal responsibilities for social services, they have 100 per cent. responsibility for maintenance for homes for the aged. You are going some distance to help that now but that has been the situation up until now. Then, too, you have had—

MR. FROST: It is hardly fair to say that because old age pensioners in institutions — institutions get $33.10 a month, so that is not all a charge to the municipality.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us take the other side of the coin. What happens to old age pensioners and Mothers' Allowance people when they go to the hospital, where their allowances will not go very far towards maintaining them? You have many cases where they become indigent and the municipalities have to take a large share of the—

MR. FROST: But we pay municipalities grants.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But to judge by the records of our hospitals in recent years it is not enough. I do not say it is entirely the government's fault. Hospital costs have been going up rapidly along with university costs and a number of other things, but you are not keeping pace with the increase of the need simply by increasing the money.

To return to the old theme song that everybody has referred to in this debate, your dollar is not worth what it was 10 years ago, so an increase of 5, 10 or 15 per cent. in your grants does not necessarily correspond with the increase in the need.

Then, I would mention the cost to many municipalities of certain health services, maintaining the medical officer of health and other services. Some of our children in the larger cities are immunized through an immunization programme and I think it is correct to say that is of value to the province as a whole. Certainly when a child is immunized in Toronto, it protects people outside Toronto as well as inside Toronto. They may get some assistance

in materials from the government but I do not think they receive financial aid. In the case of some municipalities this represents a considerable item of cost. All these things have added up to a very heavy burden on our municipalities. I am not going to say any more about it except that before you announce a budget such as this year's budget, in which you have a new system of assistance, the government ought to consider the reallocation of responsibility and not merely a re-division of the money it will dole out to municipalities. I believe, the municipalities will do a better job of self-government if they have a definite responsibility and, commensurate with that, the power to spend, to do the job it is their job to do. They should concern themselves with good government in their own sphere rather than about how much of a cut they are going to get from Queen's Park. Just before I leave the municipalities may I urge that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), when he speaks should clarify his proposals with reference to financial assistance to the municipalities, where the municipalities themselves will be debenturing some of their expenditures.

There has been some confusion about this and I want the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to pay attention so he will be able to clear it up later. In a debate the other day, which is reported at page E-11 on Monday's unprinted *Hansard,* the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) going to the rescue of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), explained the reason why—

MR. FROST: I can explain that right now to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe).

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let me put the point to you and you can explain it, or better still, explain it later this evening. I would like to get this job over with and I would get it over a little sooner if I had some attention from the treasury benches. On Monday, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) went to the rescue of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) and when he had to explain in this budget a $700,000 increase in connection with road work in municipalities—I believe we know one municipality alone is going to spend $4,800,000 in the coming year—

MR. FROST: The explanation is so simple, I know my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) would like to hear it right now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We all have to learn to restrain ourselves, both in the opposition and in the government. I am sure the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will be able to give a better explanation if he will allow me to complete the point. The point is this, on Monday, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) gave us to understand that the provincial share of this expenditure would not be one-third of the total cost, the provincial contribution would be one-third of the debenture obligation year by year. That is what we were given to understand on Monday but in another correction yesterday we were given to understand that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would not pay one-third of the debenture obligation but, as far as the fire departments are concerned, the province could contribute one-third and that would be the end of it.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would be glad to hear the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) now but my colleagues are getting impatient. The point is, the government should make up its mind whether it is going to make that one-third contribution cash on the entire expenditure or one-third of the debenture, year by year.

MR. FROST: Cash.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Cash? You have changed your mind.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) what happens is this: We pay one-third of their ordinary expenses from "Ordinary Account" and we pay one-third of their debenture expense from capital account which my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) was complaining about yesterday.

HON. MR. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): No, we don't.

MR. FROST: I am sorry. I said one-third and I mean we pay off the one-third, that is, the 33 per cent., we pay that in cash. The capital money that the city spends we pay that from capital account. Now, the reference from the budget is this: $700,000 is on ordinary account—that is the item that is on ordinary account. Now, if there are expenses on capital by the municipalities of course that is a capital item as far as we are concerned, but we will pay it in cash.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Does the Minister of Highways agree with that?

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I will answer for the Highways Department.

MR. FROST: But we will arrive at the same result, we will pay it in cash.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now, you see, Mr. Speaker, I think it is now quite clear to everybody what I meant when I got up on Monday and said: "Let us just find out where the fog is." It is quite clear it envelopes the treasury benches. However, the suggestion I wanted to make to the Treasurer is this, that in these times of buoyant revenues, in these times when he finds it expedient to throw the odd $10,000,000 into the sinking fund, above and beyond the statutory requirements, does he not think this would be a good time to undertake to get rid of one-third of those expenditures as they are incurred? I mean, in connection with all these measures, because unless he does that he is going to be adding to the debt of the province. That is the effect of the thing. Whether there is a legal commitment or not, unless he got rid of that one-third in cash each year, he would be adding each year a proportion of the debt incurred in connection with these undertakings by the municipality. I think he will agree that is correct, and I think he will agree as far as the province is concerned we ought to get these things . . .

MR. FROST: I may say that is what has been happening. We have paid back our capital expenditures now for some years.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, I would advise that you continue that policy as long as your revenues are buoyant—certainly as long as the Marshall Plan holds out.

MR. FROST: You mean our Marshall Plan or—

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost)—the Treasurer knows as well as I that the Marshall Plan has a great deal to do with his financial position today.

MR. MACLEOD: They don't have a Marshall over there, they lost him.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The European Recovery Plan, if you prefer.

There is one more matter I should refer to before I conclude, and that is the matter specifically mentioned in the amendment to the budget, moved by the hon. member from Riverdale (CCF Mr. Wismer).

In his budget address, the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) drew attention to the great increase in the cost of our health services and our health grants. The figure he gave, I think, was 30.6 million dollars, not including the federal grant which will become available this year. Now, it is true that is a very large figure. Mr. Speaker, that does not represent the total cost of health services to the people of Ontario, and this is what I would like our friends opposite, and our friends to the left of us, to take into consideration as they vote on the amendment. The people of Ontario are spending far more than 30 million odd dollars on health services, because they are not only spending 30.6 million dollars through taxes, they are also spending untold millions—and I do not pretend to estimate the total—through the group insurance plan of which we have all heard. The Blue Cross plan alone is said to have 1,300,000 subscribers, and I cannot at the moment give the total cost to those

subscribers of their insurance payments, but it certainly runs into many many millions. In addition, there are contributions by charitable organizations for the maintenance of health services, and in addition to that, there are the individual payments made by citizens of Ontario for health services, for hospitalization, for drugs, for medical services, and the like.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD: $100,000,000 a year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, that would be a very conservative estimate. Therefore, there is no use deceiving ourselves with the thought that we can curb or curtail expenditures for essential services of that kind. The real problem is how to distribute the costs most equitably and most effectively. Effectively, I say, because some costs for health services can give much better results than others, and sometimes an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. $10 spent this year might avoid an expenditure of $100 next year.

Now, there is a problem and we cannot escape it, we cannot dodge it by waiting for federal scheme. Colossal, almost incalculable, cost to the people of Ontario represented by a great deal of money over and above provincial and federal expenditures. I would draw to the attention of the House the fact it is not only in the Province of Saskatchewan that the government of the day has seen fit to introduce a prepaid hospitalization plan. The Province of British Columbia has also introduced such a plan in the Act of last year, which I have here—an "Act to Provide for the Establishment of Hospital Insurance and Financial Aid to Hospitals." This Act was introduced by a Liberal-Conservative Government in the Province of British Columbia. Now, there may be those who think they would never have done it if it were not for the pressure of the CCF. I prefer to think that the Liberal-Conservative coalition in British Columbia decided to sponsor this because they knew their people needed it and they wanted it and it could enable them to finance their hospitalization on a more economic and equitable basis than by the existing insurance schemes or individual payments to hospitals.

Now, let me say that some of us, looking to the future, hope we will live to see the day when this country will have an all-in health services plan as all-inclusive as the British plan, but we are not suggesting, and we have never suggested, that a plan of that kind is within the competence of a provincial government or legislature. We do not think that possible, certainly, but we do say that a prepaid hospital plan is within the competence of a provincial legislature, and two provinces have demonstrated it. Now, the amendment to the budget refers not only to prepaid hospitalization but a prepaid subsidized hospital plan. Why? For the simple reason it is necessary to subsidize hospitals whether it be in British Columbia or in Ontario, it is necessary to subsidize hospitals over and above the support they can receive from insurance plans and in Ontario you are doing it because you are obliged to do it and in Saskatchewan and in British Columbia they will have to do it also. The desirable feasible thing in Ontario at the present time is a prepaid subsidized hospital plan. I do not pretend for a moment that is going to meet or to solve all problems as far as health services are concerned, but I do say it would be of great benefit to the people of Ontario and it would mean a great advance in the quality and level of our hospital services. It has been said the thing cannot be because we have not got the hospitals or the hospital beds. Now, what is the nature of that objection? I cannot think of a more negative objection. It is true we have not enough hospitals or hospital beds and we have not doubled the number of hospital beds for every one thousand in population as Saskatchewan did, but that is no answer to the need for equitable economical assistance to meet hospital costs. I appreciate often under prepaid hospitalization, occasions would arise when there would not be enough accommodation for people in the hospitals and you

would have to give priority to the more urgent cases but to say there is a shortage of beds is no answer at all to the need of distributing costs on a more economical basis than at the present time. The Ministers know as well as we do it is not fair for those who happen to be struck down by accidents to be faced with hospital bills of one hundred dollars, two hundred dollars, and sometimes a thousand dollars or more. That burden does not just fall equitably and it leads to most unfair and unfortunate results.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that before the life of this government has expired, the ministers sitting opposite me now will be compelled to introduce a plan of this kind in Ontario. They may not admit it tonight but by the pressure of public opinion, or the logic of the situation, and, perhaps, to some extent because of the demands of the members on this side of the House, they will be obliged before they again go to the people, to sponsor a prepaid hospital plan in this province. Now, if you will do it, in order to face the polls at some future date, why not do it now? Why wait? Why wait as the British Columbia Government did, until a year or eighteen months before the election, thereby admitting their inability to face the facts and to take the necessary steps when they should be taken. Why not set a new standard in provincial statesmanship by doing it while an election is still some distance away? The people will honour you for it and they will be much less impressed by a pre-election hospital plan than they would if it were ready now. And I therefore suggest once more, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter to which the government should give serious reconsideration and one they should bring to this legislature in the very near future.

Now, I share with some of the other members who have spoken doubts about the date Ontario will get the report of the Royal Commission on Education. I make this suggestion—when we do at last get that report—let us hope this summer—the government consider it and call a special session so that the findings of the commission can be discussed in this House and at that same special session bring forward a well considered hospitalization plan for Ontario.

There are two items of business well worthy of a special session of this Legislature, and you will enhance your prestige, you will raise your stature in the eyes of the people of Ontario, if you take those steps at that time and not wait until it is much too late to be effective.

I know there is a federal election coming up; I think probably we will get down to business after it is over, but in any event, I leave with the government this suggestion: a special session in the autumn of 1949 to make new milestones in the progress of Ontario.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, may I take a few minutes to deal with some matters which have arisen out of the discussion which has taken place in this chamber in connection with the Budget which was presented on the 4th of this month. In so doing, I should like to thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. Leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver), who have closed the debates for their side, for their very gentlemanly presentation of the case. Mr. Speaker, I do not think either one of them really had their hearts in their job. I thought their presentation, while gentlemanly and in many ways moderate, nevertheless lacked conviction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): What would it be like if there was conviction?

MR. FROST: I was taken back a number of years, to the days when some of us who are sitting here now used to sit over on the other side there. I remember we used to talk about "economy" and "retrenchment." Both my hon. friends mentioned "retrenchment" very,

very apologetically tonight, and I may say that we used, in those days, to talk of what "'Old Man Ontario" thought about things, and I have said on a number of occasions in the last 6 years, in preparing Budget presentations, I have always had, sitting near me, an imaginary gentleman, "'Old Man Ontario" and his wife, those people who are the backbone of our great Province of Ontario. After all, "Old Man Ontario" is a very wise gentleman, and his wife is a very wise person.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): You mean the electors of Ontario?

MR. FROST: I am talking about the electors, the average man, what in law, is spoken of as "the reasonable man"; about what "Old Man Ontario," the great example of the ordinary citizen in this province thinks; and I have always had him sitting not far away from me when I have drawn these Budgets and prepared these presentations. And may I say I think my friends opposite would do well, if they reverted to the methods of those days, which, after all, were pretty sound. They resulted in the oppositions of those days —my hon. friend for Brant (Mr. Nixon) knows this is true—getting into power.

I would like to give my hon. friends opposite a bit of advice, say to you that the attitude of the opposition nowadays of "spend, spend, spend," and asking governments to spend, is not nor it is going to meet the approval of the great average citizen—the taxpayer of this province.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Who is spending $300,000,000?

MR. FROST: I am going to come to that in just a moment. I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that, after all, let us remember this—if I may just depart from the political rôle for the moment and speak a little bit of common sense—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: —As I see it, to hon. members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I am going to depart—

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): May I ask, will you tell us when you get back to the political rôle?

MR. FROST: Yes, I will do that. I am going to step out of the political rôle, and talk a little common sense to hon. members of the House, particularly to my hon. friends of the opposition. I want to say we must remember that every dollar of taxation we get comes from the people. Some people talk of "corporation taxes." Corporation taxes have the habit of being rolled into things and paid for by the people. I think it was Rt. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent who said the other day in Windsor, if I recollect rightly, that: "Social services come from everybody; they arise from the people themselves." I think that is something we should bear in mind.

My hon. friend for Brant (Mr. Nixon) mentioned, in his address—and somebody else mentioned it here—that we have here in Ontario today a $200,000,000 Budget. That is on ordinary accounts, and I am taking that figure and leaving out the capital item which would make that figure something over $300,000,000.

I am speaking of ordinary account, and we have a $200,000,000 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I well remember standing over on that side of the House six years ago, just at the present time, when my hon. friends opposite were in power, and they reached $100,000,000. I remember at that time we introduced a motion to reduce the estimates, holus bolus, by $25,000,000. I remember that, in going back to 1943.

I want to say this to you, that I, quite frankly have had some feeling in coming to this House at this time, six years later, with a $200,000,000 budget. I may say, I did expect, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, my hon. friends opposite

to turn around and say: "You are spending too much money." However, I have not heard anything of the sort from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that I use it as the theme of my address—but I must admit it has gone over the heads of hon. members opposite—I said this: "We cannot obtain everything at the same time. Our problems are many-sided, and we must build and progress with this in mind. It is essential that our growth should be balanced and uniform. Some of us are prone to emphasize one phase more than another. We should remember that all phases are important and all belong to the same picture."

My hon. friend, the Leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver) did touch on that this afternoon, although perhaps in different words. I think that is basic in the growth and development of this great province.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in passing, that with our $200,000,000, we have gone up from spending 41—nearly 42—cents on the dollar on agriculture, education and health and welfare, up to something over 52 cents on the dollar—in other words, 10 cents more is spent on those particular services than before. I give that as an illustration to show that while we are trying to build things in a balanced way, nevertheless, there is that trend to giving more to what we might call "the human services" than perhaps to the developmental side of things.

I was much impressed the other day, when I was with the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Welsh), discussing some problems relating to research with some of the university people. They were suggesting expenditures of considerable sums of money in connection with that very important phase of our development. We were having a discussion as to the whole problem and into that came the matter of the university problem. At the same time, some of our colleagues were downstairs in one of the committee rooms, meeting a very important deputation, made up of some very fine citizens of this province.

I am not going to mention by name this particular deputation, for the reason that, after all, they are not a great deal different from other deputations which we have coming here to all of us and asking for certain things. However, I would just like to give you particulars of some of the things they asked for. I was not able to be at their meeting, but I took their brief and read it over carefully. I had read their brief of 5 years ago, which was presented to this government. On reading this brief I was struck by the tremendous increase in the requests made by that same organization —and a very good organization indeed —to the government today, as compared with five years ago.

It was very startling. I will not take the time to go into it, but I will be very glad to have hon. members of the House look at the brief. I will mention the particulars and they can read them for themselves. However, I was interested in this: these people came to us—and no doubt they did so in good faith—and asked this government to do certain things. Those people were honest about it.

They asked this government to enact health insurance. Remember, I just put this in the background, Mr. Speaker, of a $200,000,000 budget, a budget which has increased two-fold since 1943, a budget of actually nearly $205,000,000, to be more accurate.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In depreciated dollars.

MR. FROST: All right, but nevertheless, it is there, it is the taxpayer's dollars. Some people have been asking for tax reductions and retrenchments. My hon. friend opposite spoke about "retrenchment" in a very apologetic way. I do not blame him for being apologetic for all the things he asked for.

But to get back to this one brief. They asked for health insurance. Now, Mr. Speaker, we here can only take, as far as the Dominion Government is concerned, what they are presently offering to us, but remember, we are asked to

bring these things in now, and then depend on the future to get us out of trouble.

Here is what we were being asked for. Health insurance, which would cost us $132,000,000; we would get according to our best calculation $57,000,000 from present plans from the dominion, so that would cost us $75,000,000. They asked for old-age pensions of $60 a month with a cost-of-living bonus payable in certain cases down as far as 55 years of age, and without any means test. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that would cost us $395,000,000. Put that in the background of what we are spending today, which made me feel guilty when I sat in the room with "Old Man Ontario" preparing this Budget. $395,000,000, less the dominion liability at present rates, which is the best we can take, and less our present budget commitments of some $12,000,000, and it would cost us some $360,000,000.

In regard to mothers' allowances; they asked for another $5,000,000. They asked us to enter into low-rental housing subsidies, which, if you take 20,000 houses, we contribute $4,000 a house—and my hon. friend here beside me (Mr. Porter) said, in his studies of the matter, perhaps that might be a reasonable figure—is another $80,000,000.

They asked for milk subsidies; that we should pay subsidies which would reduce the cost of milk to the wartime level. That would cost us another $30,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken five items there—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, before my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) leaves those items, will he permit a question?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The first item you mentioned, that is the health insurance plan—

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: —which, incidentally, I made very clear a little earlier, is not being put forward by us as a feasible thing provincially. However, my question is this, is the cost which he mentioned a gross or a net cost?

MR. FROST: I am talking about the net cost, the cost to the province as is estimated by our statistical department.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But would it be gross or net? Would it be after allowing for present contributions, or not?

MR. FROST: That would be after allowing for the dominion contribution, after allowing for what we might say was in our budgetary arrangement. We would have to raise by imposts on the people some $75,000,000. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) will agree that is a very moderate figure. I doubt if we could do it at all. That means $550,000,000, which one deputation of citizens of this province came and asked this government to contribute, and yet some of us are staggered by the fact we have a $200,000,000 budget at the present time.

Let us now look at the other side of the picture.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (CCF Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister (Mr. Frost) answer a question?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. DOWLING: Did this same delegation ask for approval of its compensation benefits, and what will that cost the government?

MR. FROST: I have left the compensation out of it for this reason, that if workmen's compensation were included, it is a charge against industry and not a charge we would have to raise here in the way of taxes. I want to be fair to my hon. friend (Mr. Dowling) and I am talking of our part of the bill, so to speak in this Assembly.

I want to discuss the subject of taxes. This deputation came to us and made

certain suggestions for tax changes. They said: Raise your corporation tax to 10 per cent." All right, that would produce, at the present rates about $21,000,000 if that were done. However, they asked that we repeal the amusement, or hospital tax. There is $6,500,000 off. They asked us also to reduce the gallonage tax on beer by half. We have calculated if it were cut in half, that would represent $2,000,000, which makes $8,500,000, which would reduce it to a net of $12,500,000, Mr. Speaker, to meet a bill of $550,000,000.

These are figures which make us think.

I would like now to step out of a political rôle and talk a little bit of common sense for a time. By that, I mean exactly what I am saying, that I want to take all the political glamour and tinsel and what-not out of these things and let us here, as 90 hon. members representing the people of this great province, see to where these things lead us. After all, when demands are made which are out of the way and unreasonable, they are not doing a service to our people of the province. They are not doing a service to anybody. They are misleading the people and making them believe that in this province we can do things we cannot do.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Are you talking about us?

MR. FROST: Yes, I am talking about you.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then deal with our proposals.

MR. FROST: I will come to you in a moment. I have mentioned $550,000,000 in one proposal which was made by an organization—

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Not on the floor of the House.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: (LP St. Andrew): It is an unfair way of presenting the proposals of that organization.

AN HON. MEMBER: How would you know?

MR. FROST: My friends opposite are very friendly, and I do not raise any unfriendly suggestion about these people, but I want to say that is just one organization which has come, and my friends opposite, if they will take that word "retrenchment" and then get their feet on the ground instead of being away up in a fog, they would do a lot better for the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: The fog is not up, it is down.

MR. FROST: I do say administration of the province has got to be orderly and sensible and has got to be based upon the common sense and wisdom this great province has shown in the past, which is reflected by the great prosperity and great developments we have across the face of this very fortunate land.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Is it common sense that caused the shelving of the "Twenty-two Points?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, go on.

MR. FROST: I would like to say to hon. members of the House something about old-age pensions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good, good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: $40?

MR. SALSBERG: How about doing something about it, instead of talking?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, sit down.

MR. FROST: I want to say something about old-age pensions and I want to tell you something about the problem there is in connection with that matter, because it is a very great and serious problem. I can say, Mr. Speaker, to

hon. members of the House, this government is far from satisfied with the old-age pension situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: It should be.

MR. FROST: We are quite satisfied ourselves, and I think many hon. members opposite feel this way, that satisfactory results in connection with old-age pensions cannot be obtained until the basic pension is universal and without the means test.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: They do not agree with that.

MR. FROST: Well, we say that is basic, that until that is done you are going to have the difficulty and irritation with which we are presently faced. If there were a universal pension, somewhat the same as the family allowance, and subject to income tax, and without the means test provision, we would have most of our difficulties taken care of, even at the $30 level, even if the Dominion Government did not increase the basic amount.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is quite right, but we cannot have everything all at once.

MR. FROST: All right, we cannot have everything all at once, but I am going now to step out of the role of—

AN HON. MEMBER: Common sense.

MR. FROST: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is theory.

MR. FROST: I am going to make a political forecast. There is going to be a budget on the 22nd of this month and you will find there are going to be very much increased exemptions in connection with income tax. That is one thing you are going to have, but you are going to have the Dominion Government go into a scheme of universal pensions. I say to my hon. friend, the Leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver) that we will see on the 23rd of March if that is not borne out. I will be very greatly disappointed if that is not the case.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (L Grey South): This is just a prophesy, is it?

MR. FROST: That is not so far from the realm of what is possible, because the Dominion Government here some three years ago, in 1945, proposed a universal pension of $30 a month, and in the dominion-provincial discussions which took place, it was admitted this was the only feasible way of meeting this very difficult problem.

Speaking of old age pensions, my hon. friend opposite has given some of the history of this matter and his summary was quite proper. In 1943, the basic pension was $20 a month, on the 29th of June, to be exact, the day this House dissolved. I would not accuse my friends opposite of ever "playing politics"—

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, I should hope not.

MR. FROST: The $3 bonus was added on that particular date. On November 3rd, 1943, the basic pension was raised by means of a dominion contribution to $25 a month. Just about that time, this government negotiated to take what we called the "mortgages" off the old pensioners' homes, and provision was made that old age pensioners could own property up to $2,000, which would not be assessable in event of their death for the amount of pension paid. They could also have $2,000 cash.

In November, 1946, it went up to $30, then in July, 1947, the $10 supplement, which has been the subject of much discussion in this House, was introduced. In February, 1948, the terms of those regulations were widened and were widened again in May, 1948, with the result that in June, 1943, a single person could get a total pension and private income of $360, and a married person could get $720; in November, 1943, the single person's income went up to $420 from $360, and the married

person's to a maximum of $840, from $720.

In 1947 the amount went up again to $600 for a single person, and for the married couple, to $1,080 maximum income, which meant the total pension and earnings of $360 for single persons in 1943 went up to $600, and for married persons from $720 to $1,080. That was without the provincial bonus.

Mr. Speaker, may I now give you these costs, which are interesting? In 1943, the pension at that time, which I believe went to about 57,000 pensioners, cost $3,500,000. Last year that went up to approximately $10,000,000, that is for the year just closing, and the estimates for next year are $11,700,000 —approaching $12,000,000—for pensions—so may I point out that while our budget has doubled, our contributions to pensions has just about tripled in that time, in fact, it has more than tripled.

I want now to get down to the question of bonus and show you the problem there is in connection with that. Of the nine present provinces of Canada, three have no bonus, six have varying schemes, which of course are based upon the situations which they have in those various provinces. In Ontario we have this situation, we have cities, towns, villages, country areas and developmental areas and we have in addition to that the varying circumstances of the pensioners themselves, and in addition, the particular needs of an individual. An individual pensioner, although he may be receiving the maximum allowance and income on pension, may actually speaking be in serious difficulties because of the fact he had illness—either he or his wife—which changed his circumstances. Those are situations you have to meet.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, in going over this matter very briefly and hurriedly, that in 1943 my hon. friends opposite entered into the bonus system, which I think we will all agree was an innovation in Canada at that time, or pretty close to it. It is extremely doubtful whether the province ever should have began that particular class of payment; for this reason. As I stated in the budget address, it always has been contended by the provinces that the old age pension matter was something for the central government. I am not saying that was particularly our contention here in Ontario, but it was the contention of all of the nine provinces and anyone who has studied proceedings of the various Dominion-Provincial Conferences will find that is a common contention. That is why I said, in the budget address, that, generally speaking, the measures designed to redistribute the services by means of old age pensions, family allowances and other social benefits, are the responsibilities of the Federal Government, and in view of their broad taxing powers, credit control, currency and international trade. That is not my opinion. I am giving you the opinion of the provinces, as many times expressed.

My hon. friends, in 1943, were met with a very difficult situation. The fact of the matter is that $20 was not adequate, and they were endeavouring to meet it by an increase of 15 per cent. across the board, depending on the size of the pension. That is, if a pensioner was getting $10 a month, he got $1.50. If he was getting $20 a month, he got $3.

If we accept what has been generally accepted by all the provinces, that we should not be in the pension business at all, then I think it comes down to this; if the province is going to give anything in addition to the basic pensions, which we contend is a dominion matter, that is a form of public assistance which we believe must be added to the pension on the basis of need.

I would say to my hon. friends opposite I know you may dispute that, but you will see the difficulty in just a moment, if you will be patient with me.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) answer a question?

MR. FROST: May I develop this, and then I will answer my friend afterwards.

I want you to consider this point,

that at the present time, in the Province of Ontario, we have a trifle over 80,000 pensioners. Remember, these pensioners live in very expensive areas such as we have here in the City of Toronto, out across the rural areas and in the new country, and what not; they are living under varying conditions. I come from a town of about 10,000 in the centre of a partly agriculture and partly developmental area, and I run across a fair cross-section of the problem. The other day when I got home to Lindsay and got my feet on the grass some of my friends came around to see me. I had an old gentleman, 85 years old, whom I have not seen for a long time, come to see me. He has a farm which he rents for $240 a year. I say this to my hon. friend for East York (Miss MacPhail), whom I know has given this matter a great deal of attention. I would like to give her one or two of these cases.

This old gentleman gets $240, and gets the basic pension of $30, so he is getting $600, which is $50 a month, and he is living with his son. He does not ask for a supplementary bonus of $10. The old gentleman is living with his son and daughter on a farm in that area, and I may say, without divulging a secret, the old gentleman is not spending the money he is getting.

I will give you another case. The other day an old gentleman came in to see me. He is 70 years of age. He lives with his daughter. He has $2,000 in the bank, and frankly he came to see his old friend to draw his will, because he has this $2,000, and he wants to leave it to his family. He is getting $30 a month, living with his son and daughter-in-law on the farm, and is not asking for $10 a month, which, I will say to my hon. friends opposite, if we took from the people and gave it to that old gentleman, would have to be paid for—

MISS MACPHAIL: You are talking politically now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: I want to give you the other side of the picture. An old gentleman, 75 years of age, came to see me. He is totally incapacitated and crippled. He has no son nor daughter. He has no place to live, and does not own a farm. He is boarding, and his landlady, in order to look after the old gentleman, has to have more than $24 a month. What are you going to do? There is a man who needs it. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that probably if we could revise our system—and I am satisfied we can do it with the help and understanding of our people—it is quite possible that the old gentleman instead of receiving a $10 supplementary bonus might be receiving $20.

And I can present another case of a man and woman who came in to see me. I know them quite well. Both of them are frail, and up against it. At the present time they are getting the basic pensions; they are paying $20 a month rent, and have to buy medicine, and things like that. In that case they are getting a supplementary allowance, and they should. It may be that the supplementary allowance is not sufficient. But you will see the problem—

MISS MACPHAIL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) what he is trying to tell us? We all know people who do not have enough to eat. It is not so remarkable. They do not all live around Lindsay.

MR. FROST: I am trying to tell you what is going on. There are four typical cases in this province.

MISS MACPHAIL: They are untypical; they are not typical at all.

MR. FROST: Supposing we gave $10 across the board to all these cases, the fact is that the ones who did not need it, would get the $10 which actually must come from the taxpayers of this province.

MISS MACPHAIL: They must be rolling in wealth.

MR. FROST: The other two persons would get $10, but that might not be sufficient. There is an inequity there, and there is the difficulty in this

province, of entering into an even contribution across the board. I see my friend from Kitchener-Waterloo (Mr. Brown) nodding his head in approval.

I think it is reasonable and common sense. Mr. Speaker, I do want to say this; considering the 80,000 cases we have at the present time, you can see that there is a very real problem in connection with this matter.

Supposing, Mr. Speaker, this happened: on the 22nd of March the Dominion Government were to bring in a universal scheme, which I have prophesied and they gave everybody of 70 years and over an old-age pension without the means test. That means that the old-age pensioners can have, not $240, but they can have $1,000 a year, or they can have $50,000 a year. The Dominion Government would, of course, level things off, as they have levelled off income taxes and family allowances.

Let us see what our problem would be if that occurred. If the 80,000 cases we have, are increased $10 a month across the board, where will we begin or end with the other one? Actually speaking, Mr. Speaker, we should have to come to the point of coming down to what is basic, and that is a public-assistance allowance based upon need. That is inevitable.

Mr. Speaker, our position is just this: we have this system in force now. I want to say that if, on the 22nd of this month, the Dominion Government took that step, which we think would be very forward, what would happen? This province is in the position to meet the situation. We know the cases where there is need. We can take those cases, and we can provide for them over and above the basic amount. To be frank with you, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is ever possible for a central government to arrive at a basic pension which will meet all of those cases of need. An essential part of this system is a system which we have presently working, and I think much of the criticism we are getting at the present time is because there is a misunderstanding of what we are trying to arrive at, and what we are trying to do.

Under our present system, a person may have the maximum; he may be receiving $600 a year from pensions and personal income, and yet their circumstances, if they are straitened can come in on the basis of need, and get the $10 bonus.

I quite agree that there are things which have to be remedied in that system, and I should think, Mr. Speaker, we should try to remedy those things with common sense, and in a sympathetic and understanding way.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has asked me to refer to this: I said I think the plan itself is good. I think the plan is sound. Indeed, I do not know of any plan to which this province can turn which will entirely meet the situation. At the present time, remember, we are faced with this; we have the difficulty of the means test, which presently enters into the basic bonus, but that is a situation I think which will be taken care of in the course of time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, will my friend (Mr. Frost) before he leaves the subject, since he has told us about the plan, also tell us about some of the difficulties in its administration?

MR. FROST: Yes, I was going to do that, right away.

First of all, let us be reasonable and use common sense in arriving at a plan. The next thing is, the plan may be good, but the administration of it may be bad. We recognize that. That seems to me to be logical, and the question is, is our administration good? We have at the present time somewhere about 140 investigators in the province. These investigators are looking after 80,000 people, and in the last little while the number has grown from 57,000 to the present 80,000. The investigators know the personal incomes of these pensioners has been raised, and I think in the last year or year and a half there have been three revisions in connection with this. These investigators have not

waited for the old people to come to them; they have gone out and re-investigated the 80,000 cases. There is an administrative problem right there.

Furthermore, we are doing this; we are presently met with 80,133 cases, and it is estimated the case load will grow, and we have made provision for that growth. We have this additional conflicting matter, and my friends opposite will see the difficulty. You will never be out of difficulty, and for this reason: these people are over 70 years of age, and under the normal mortality rate, we will have 8,000 of them die this year, but there will be others coming in year after year, and there are bound to be cases of need. Our investigators are decent people, and they are trying to do their part, and they have to use their judgment, and in some cases, their judgment may be wrong. A pensioner may come to me, or go to you, and say, "I am not getting a square deal." I am bound to say that if anybody has ever used sympathy and reason, and leaned over backward to try and give these people a "break," it is the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) allow a question? Do you think when your investigators have been out checking and re-checking 80,000 old-age pensions, it is true when you say there are only 3,000 who are in need and require that $10 bonus?

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Leavens) is quite wrong about that. My recollection is the number of people receiving public assistance on the basis of need is something over 20,000. I am not just sure of that figure, but they can be given to you later. There are varying conditions which enter into the problem.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Would the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) allow a question? In view of the reference to "Old Man Ontario," would the government agree to ask "Old Man Ontario" now, in a special questionnaire, by a referendum, whether they agree to the payment of $10 supplementary allowance to all the old-age pensioners?

MR. FROST: I would say, my friend knows that is a silly suggestion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: It is a very sensible suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: Will the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) permit another question?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, let me say—

MR. SALSBERG: Will he yield?

MR. FROST: Yes, I am glad to.

MR. SALSBERG: Then yield. According to the ruling of Mr. Speaker, you must sit down if you yield. That is what I was waiting for. I may say that facetious reply that it is "silly" is of course no reply, and I say the government is afraid to ask "Old Man Ontario," because they know what "Old Man Ontario" would answer.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in this place we are grown up people. We are elected by the people of the Province of Ontario—

MR. SALSBERG: Then trust them—

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: We are elected by the people of Ontario to do their business; let us do it in a business-like way, and not be silly.

There are bound to be difficult cases. There are always difficult cases, but I do say that the test of the thing is this; are we taking a sympathetic approach and a kindly approach, and are we taking care of these cases?

MR. SALSBERG: No.

MR. FROST: I can assure you that our 140 investigators, from the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) down, are doing everything that can be done to meet this very difficult problem. I have no objection myself to the hon. members of this House pointing out cases where we have fallen down, because it is inevitable we should fall down. Nevertheless, I say this to you, do not embark from what is a level-headed point of view—and I say that to my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Salsberg)—upon a scheme which will not meet the needs of the people who need it, and which will saddle our taxpayers heavily without the funds going to the place and to the people who should get it. That is all I have to say about old age pensions.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with what I have said.

I just want to say a word as regards the amendment which was introduced by my hon. friends opposite. I was much impressed with what the hon. Leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver) said. I was impressed, but at the same time I was distressed, at the attitude he took. He said he was not quite satisfied with this amendment, but he was going to vote for it.

MR. OLIVER: That is right.

MR. FROST: Just a minute. I do not blame you for not being quite satisfied with it, for this reason; we are anxious to have a hospitalization scheme which will go across the province and we will get it, under this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Here is the situation. My friend (Mr. Oliver) opposite put his finger right on the matter. At the present time we have not the hospital beds. The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) will tell you that we have 25 per cent. of our population—that may be large, but I imagine it is about right—under various types of schemes, such as the Blue Cross, and what not, and the fact of the matter is our hospitals are presently so crowded you can hardly get into them. What would happen if we placed the 4,500,000 people of Ontario under a scheme at the present time?

MR. JOLLIFFE: What happens now?

MR. FROST: Here is what would happen. The minute a person became ill, they would say, "I am a taxpayer; I am paying for this, and I want to go to the hospital," and there would be no place for them. They would say we are taking money under false pretences, if we tried to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: The problem in Saskatchewan is not ours at the present time.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): May I ask the hon. Minister a question, Mr. Speaker? Is it not a fact that the very argument you are using now shows the need is not being met by the agreements available.

MR. FROST: Of course not. And why? Here is the situation: We came in here some five and one-half years ago, and we introduce for the first time in any province in Canada capital assistance for the construction of hospitals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: This was so sound that Saskatchewan, and other provinces followed, and was so sound that the Dominion Government, last May—

MISS MACPHAIL: You are really in a bad way.

MR. FROST: I want to say to my hon. friends that you cannot press a button and build a great hospital here on University Avenue, or down at Winchester, or up in Grey County. It takes time. It will take time to get the thousands of rooms required in this project. But we are taking a sound, reasonable approach to this matter.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (CCF St. David): Four years late.

MR. FROST: Hospital rooms by the thousands are being added to our hospitals, and some of these days we will be able to have a health scheme in the Province of Ontario, under which we will not be taking money under false pretences, but under which we can give 100-cents-on-the-dollar-value to our people, and that is what we are after.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is giving money from the Treasury to hospitals now; what do you tell people now, when they ask you why they cannot get into the hospitals?

MR. FROST: Now, now, my friend (Mr. Jolliffe). The fact of the matter is that we are facing a great problem, and we are facing it with courage and enterprise, and we are meeting it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: The time is getting late; it is twenty-five to ten. I just want to conclude what I have to say. I want to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) opposite, when he says he is not satisfied, I do not blame him for not being satisfied with an amendment of this sort.

What does the amendment mean? It means that my hon. friends, opposite, aided by their two fellow-travellers over there, are endeavouring to pull the wool over the eyes of "Old Man Ontario."

I say this to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), opposite, talking about reviving the grand old Liberal Party in this province, personally, I would like to see it revived but I think if he would get out of that political cave, in which he is sandwiched in between Social Democrats, Fabian Socialists, mild Socialists, Parlour pinks and and right down to the deep "Red" we have over there. If he could get out of that political cave over there where all the dissatisfied people are, where all the people are with difficulties and grouches, he should get out of it.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Who put us here, anyway? We did not ask for these seats.

HON. MR. FROST: I want to say this, if I can use my Lincolnian expression in a larger sense, "Old Man Ontario" put you right there.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) yield?

HON. MR. FROST: I say this—

MR. SALSBERG: Will he yield?

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. Just a moment please. I think we want to be perfectly fair. If any hon. member has a question and the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) who is speaking wishes to allow an hon. member to ask a question, as I have already said, that is all right. But let us please be fair. If any hon. member wishes to ask a question, it is left with the hon. member speaking to decide whether he will yield or not.

HON. MR. FROST: I think I have heard enough from my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg), as have, I think, all the hon. members of the House.

When I heard my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), representing a great party in this province, speak the way he did this afternoon, I go out and look at the picture of the late Sir Oliver Mowat, the great Liberal leader for twenty-four years and a former Premier of this province, and leader of his party, and I see Sir Oliver looking down from his picture and seeing these gentlemen opposite who would rather vote with the Addullamites and pull the wool over "Old Man Ontario's" eyes rather than vote for a good, level-headed suggestion, I think old Sir Oliver must turn in his picture when he sees that. If my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) follows the course divided by the socialists clan and Addullamites on one side and "Reds" on the other, it will be obliteration that will face his party, rather than ascendency to power.

As far as the party on this side of the House is concerned; we are sure of our ground; we know where we are going, we are going straight down the broad road of progress, heading down the centre of the road and providing for the development of this great province. We are trying to deal with the problems as

they arise, and we are going forward in confidence that we are going to have a greater province and a more prosperous people and this province is going to prosper for many years under the rule of the Progressive Conservative Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The vote is on the amendment to the motion.

Call in the members.

The House divided.

The amendment was negatived on division.

YEAS: 34
NAYS: 45

HON. MR. FROST: The same division on the motion?

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): No.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): No.

The House divided. The motion agreed to on division.

YEAS: 45
NAYS: 34

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

MR. FROST: Page 73, Item 115.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Office of the Lieutenant-Governor, page 73, vote 115.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): It is not proposed to give the $2,000 increase to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor?

MR. FROST: I do not see anything about that here.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Before the vote is called, I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) can assure us on this point? I have seen some press reports recently about the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor borrowing his state uniform. Do you think there is enough in the allowance for new state uniforms when required?

MR. FROST: I have not heard anything about "state uniforms."

Vote No. 115 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs leave to report that it has come to a certain resolution, asks leave to sit again, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to revert to third readings, to clear up a bit of the Order Paper if I can in the next hour. I would like to take third readings and then go to second readings following that.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 2nd Order.

WOLF AND BEAR BOUNTY ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 2nd Order; third reading of Bill No. 102, "An Act to amend The Wolf and Bear Bounty Act, 1946," Mr. Scott.

HON. WILLIAM GRIESINGER (PC Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Scott, I move third reading of Bill No. 102, "An Act to amend the Wolf and Bear Bounty Act, 1946."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 3rd Order.

PRESQU'IL PARK ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 3rd Order, third reading of Bill No. 105, "An Act to amend The Presqu'il Park Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, I move third reading of Bill No. 105, "An Act to amend The Presqu'il Park Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 4th Order;

LONG POINT PARK ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 4th Order; third reading of Bill No. 106, "An Act to amend the Long Point Park Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, I move the third reading of Bill No. 106, "An Act to amend the Long Point Park Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 5th Order;

FEDERATION FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 5th Order; third reading of Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting The Federation for Community Service of Toronto," Mr. Rea.

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting The Federation for Community Service of Toronto."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 6th Order;

MOUNT McKAY & KAKABEKA FALLS RAILWAY COMPANY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 6th Order; third reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting The Mount McKay and Kakabeka Falls Railway Company," Mr. Cox.

MR. R. A. McEWING: (L Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Cox, I move third reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting The Mount McKay and Kakabeka Falls Railway Company."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 7th Order;

INCORPORATED SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th Order; third reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting The Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Toronto," Mr. Rea.

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting The Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Toronto."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 8th Order;

TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th Order; third reading of Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough," Miss MacPhail.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 9th Order;

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 9th Order; third reading of Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting Wycliffe College," Mr. Rea.

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 7, "An Act respecting Wycliffe College."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 10th Order;

INCORPORATED SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF ONTARIO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order; third reading of Bill No. 15, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ontario," Mr. Stewart.

MR. W. E. HAMILTON (PC Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Stewart, I move third reading of Bill No. 15, "An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ontario."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 11th Order.

FRONTENAC HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 11th Order; third reading of Bill No. 8, "An Act to establish the Frontenac High School District," Mr. Pringle.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (PC Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Pringle, I move third reading of Bill No. 8, "An Act to establish the Frontenac High School District."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 12th Order.

L'INSTITUT JEANNE D'ARC

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 12th Order; third reading of Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting l'Institut Jeanne d'Arc," Mr. Nault.

MR. J. D. NAULT (PC Russell): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting l'Institut Jeanne d'Arc."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 13th Order.

CITY OF CHATHAM

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 13th Order; third reading of Bill No. 12, "An Act respecting the City of Chatham," Mr. Parry.

MR. G. W. PARRY (PC Kent West): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 12, "An Act respecting the City of Chatham."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 14th Order.

HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 14th Order; third reading of Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting The Hospital for Sick Children," Mr. Rea.

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting The Hospital for Sick Children."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 15th Order.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 15th Order; third reading of Bill No. 14, "An Act respecting the City of Belleville," Mr. Sandercock.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (PC Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Sandercock, I move third reading of Bill No. 14, "An Act respecting the City of Belleville."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 16th Order.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 16th Order; third reading of Bill No. 20, "An Act respecting McMaster University," Mr. Hamilton.

MR. W. E. HAMILTON (PC Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 20, "An Act respecting McMaster University."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 17th Order.

ONTARIO CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 17th Order; third reading of Bill No. 26, "An Act to incorporate the Ontario Co-operative Credit Society," Mr. Cathcart.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (PC Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 26, "An Act to incorporate the Ontario Co-operative Credit Society."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 18th Order.

NIAGARA PARKS ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 18th Order; third reading of Bill No. 89, "The Niagara Parks Act, 1949," Mr. Daley.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that Bill No. 89, "The Niagara Parks Act, 1949," be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend it by striking out Section No. 9.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to let that order stand for the moment and we will proceed with the other bills and deal with that later.

Bill No. 89 stands.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 19th Order.

HOSPITALS AID ACT, 1948

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 19th Order; third reading of Bill No. 90, "An Act to amend The Hospitals Aid Act, 1948." Mr. Kelley.

HON. R. T. KELLEY (PC Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 90, "An Act to amend The Hospitals Aid Act, 1948."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 20th Order.

THE SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT, 1947

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 20th Order; third reading of Bill No. 91, "An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act, 1947." Mr. Kelley.

HON. R. T. KELLEY (PC Minister of Health): I move third reading of Bill No. 91, "An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act, 1947."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 21st Order.

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 21st Order; third reading of Bill No. 103, "The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949." Mr. Blackwell.

MR. FROST: In the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I move third reading of Bill No. 103, "The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 22nd Order.

THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT, 1939

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 22nd Order, third reading of Bill No. 112, "An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act, 1939."

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 23rd Order.

THE INCOME TAX ACT (Ontario)

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 23rd Order, third reading of Bill No. 114, "An Act to suspend The Income Tax Act (Ontario)." Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 114, "An Act to suspend The Income Tax Act (Ontario)."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 38th Order.

THE TILE DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 38th Order, second reading of Bill No. 118,

"An Act to amend the Tile Drainage Act." Mr. Doucett.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act."

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) explain the general principles of this bill?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, I am very happy to do so. The Tile Drainage Act is an act that has been on the Statute Book for some time and we are proposing to make two minor changes, one is to increase the loan from $2,000 to $3,000 for any hundred acres of land or portion thereof. The other change is that regarding inspection—a satisfactory report before payment is made. Those are the only changes in the Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 39th Order.

THE DITCHES AND WATERCOURSES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 39th Order, second reading of Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend The Ditches and Watercourses Act." Mr. Doucett.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 119, An Act to amend The Ditches and Watercourses Act.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): I would like to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Doucett) on this bill.

MR. DOUCETT: If you just give me a moment, I will be very happy to explain it.

MR. OLIVER: I am glad to hear that.

MR. DOUCETT: The Ditches and Watercourses Act is a very old act, and is one which is gradually passing out of existence, with the exception of a few small sections in the Province of Ontario. It is a scheme costing under $2,500 and which would or could include seven lots. After that, it is municipal drainage. We are only recommending a couple of changes by this bill and one is to provide for an appeal to the County Judge where the engineer refuses to make an award on the ground the ditch is not required or is impracticable or cannot be constructed under the Act and the other to provide for method of apportioning the award against a farm when part of the farm is later sold. That is, it will now be done in the future by council. The bill is designed to assure that awards and agreements made under the Act will be readily accessible to persons desiring to search for these records. This is merely a little tidying up.

MR. DENNISON: I read a review —it is not very fresh in my mind now —a review of Select Committee of this House and made, I believe, back in 1937 or 1938 dealing with water levels in the Province of Ontario, and the recommendations they made at that time, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) if this bill should not be enlarged to include those recommendations. The recommendations that they made at that time were to the effect that in the south part of this province there should not be a ditch allowed unless a survey was made to find out whether that ditch would be beneficial or harmful to the whole area, that water levels in the main farm areas of south Ontario have dropped to a danger point and in many counties there were ditches put in and water drained off and marshes drained that never should have been allowed.

MR. W. MURDOCH (PC Essex South): What county is that?

MR. DENNISON: One is the Luther marsh at the head of the Grand River, and it should never have been drained, and because that Luther marsh was drained, the cities and farms down the Grand River have suffered for years because it lowered the water levels and lack of proper reservoir at the head of the river. Now, it seems to me, if the government should bring in a bill to

amend the Act, they should have brought in a bill which would have paid some attention to the recommendations of that study made some years ago.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): I think possibly, Mr. Speaker, the opinion expressed by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is probably a little out of date now because the Grand River Commission has been an Authority there for some time and they have definitely decided that draining of that area some years ago was a mistake, and they have a definite plan now to hold back the water.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He was giving it as an example.

MR. McEWING: As far as a natural storage for water, I think the Luther marsh is probably the cheapest storage basin they have there for the money that will be expended, and should never have been drained out, but engineers who went up in there at that time decided it should be drained out and under that Act, if so many people asked for it, it should be done.

Today, under the new Act, we are trying to get some amendments so the scheme should justify the cost of doing it, which it never did in that case.

I think these Acts have come out of the recommendations of the Drainage Committee, which made a survey here a year or so ago, but I think there is some truth in what my friend said, but it is not quite as serious as that.

I certainly favour these recommendations in this Act.

MR. G. W. PARRY (PC Kent West): Mr. Chairman, I think maybe I should say something regarding this committee which was set up in 1947. I will give you some of the work which has been done by this committee.

The hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Cathcart), the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) and myself, as a committee, selected to consider the drainage problems and the cost of recommendations, made an extensive survey and held meetings at Chatham, London, Guelph, Toronto, Belleville, Kingston and one other place—I know there were six or seven towns.

MR. McEWING: Brockville.

MR. PARRY: We called in a group of interested parties, of the county officials adjacent to these towns. We gathered a great deal of information. That report was submitted to this House in 1948 and, for the information of some hon. members who were not present at that time, we discovered a great many difficulties regarding drainage. In all cases there was a lack of material for tiling, that is, the high cost of tile, and a shortage of ditching machinery. However, I am sure hon. gentlemen understand that was caused by war conditions.

However, through our recommendations we improved these Acts, I think, considerably. We have acted with the best engineers we have in this Province of Ontario, two engineers from the west and one from the east, where there are varied conditions.

I might explain also what I mean by "varied conditions." We have flat soil, we have rolling soil and then we have stony soil. These conditions all have their hazards regarding using ditching machinery.

I would like now to say something about these Acts. There are four different Acts. The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act is administered under the Department of Public Works, as is also the Interprovincial Drainage Act. The Municipal Drainage Act is administered under the Treasury Department, as is also the Tile Drainage Act. We have then the Conservation Authorities Act, which is administered under the Department of Planning and Development.

I would like to make a few observations. I think in going over these bills, if there is any part that is not quite understandable, we could explain conditions and I think these points have been "tidied up," as the expression was used here. These Acts have been

proven and we have tried to put them in practically, so that the common, ordinary layman understands them.

I might say, as the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has expressed, the old Ditches and Watercourses Act is an Act which served a mighty good purpose, but it is antiquated. Today we have the Municipal Drainage Act whereby a drain can be completed in a short time, which is a great advantage to this system of drainage. We have machinery today that can be used for tiling purposes—or ditching purposes — where the old Ditches and Watercourses Act, as I suppose a great many hon. members here will remember, was carried out by men or horses and scrapers.

I am not going to take up too much time dealing with these Acts. I think they have been simplified so they are quite understandable, but I do want to make one or two observations, with your permission. In my own opinion, we have two or three big problems. The drainage creates other problems, you must understand; there is the problem of floods, and a flood is a serious thing. When we had plenty of forests, we were not confronted with floods. Noah had a little trouble, however. It was due to excess rain, and of course, we go to extremes. We had a shortage of rain last fall, and we had the blackout, you will remember. However, speaking seriously to hon. members of the House, I would like, as a Canadian citizen, and we are talking here as Canadian citizens, to say we have great responsibilities.

I was glad to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) comment in the House about "soil conservation" and "soil erosion." These all add up to this one thing, drainage; unless we think about reforestation, which I believe is the solution, and, together with a series of dams, will serve as a prevention to floods; however, I would urge the government to increase the supply of trees, and it is our duty to use all sources of supply of trees and put them to good use.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARRY: We have thousands of acres of soil in this great land of ours which could be used for growing trees, which would leave a heritage to the generations which are going to follow us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARRY: I have not a great deal more to say, but I believe this is a very vital point—reforestation is going to combat soil erosion and it is going to help flood control, along with dams. It can be done, by whom? By the people of this province. I urge the government to give a supply of trees and then we, as Canadians, must see we put them to good use by doing a little more reforesting in the Province of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Do I understand from the remarks of the hon. member for Kent West (Mr. Parry), this bill is designed to help that reforestation situation?

MR. PARRY: What is the question?

MR. MILLARD: Do I understand you suggest this bill is designed to fit in with the scheme of reforestation?

MR. PARRY: Of reforestation?

MR. MILLARD: Yes.

MR. PARRY: No, not reforestation. That is our duty. As I said, that is our duty to do that.

MR. MILLARD: Then, what is the purpose of the bill we are discussing?

MR. McEWING: Mr. Chairman, I think probably I can clear that point for our friend, the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard). Under the old Drainage Act, the thought was, years ago, to get all the water off the land.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. McEWING: They never thought of saving some moisture in sub-marginal lands, which ought not to have been drained. Everything was drained. Under the old Act, if one or two persons asked for a drain, they could force it through. They might force it right through an area which should have been left as a natural forest, and which was of no use if it was drained, but under the old Act, the drain which could be forced through would drain that land, the bush would die and you would lose the benefit of it.

Under the suggestions we made in regard to drainage reform, we can remove some of that problem, as you could not force a drain through an area which was sub-marginal land and should not be drained.

A condition like that is one of a number of things which we tried to remedy, and that is where the relationship comes in. When you think of that, you realize some of those places should be planted again, places which had been drained out and the trees had died. You get the moisture back in and the trees will grow again. If we could get a good supply of additional trees, a better supply than we have had in the past, we can get a lot of that land reforested again.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing), who was on this study a few years ago, if there was not a recommendation at that time, in addition to the recommendation of an engineer in the matter you should also have the recommendation of a soil expert or a person who knew something about the need in that area of water levels? As I see the principle of this bill, you have a provision to get the advice of engineers, and some of the ditches which have been dug in this province and which should not have been dug, were dug on the advice of engineers. Those people very often do not know when to stop digging ditches, that is the trouble. Was there not a recommendation that some advice should be secured from a soil expert and a conservation expert before ditches were put in anywhere?

MR. McEWING: Mr. Speaker, if I may have the right to say a word or two more; under the river authorities as now, they have control of all those watersheds and you cannot step into any of those on which the authorities are set up and drain in a manner that they would have years ago, because there was no authority in there, and you could just step in and drain whatever you liked and not what the other fellow liked. Today you cannot do that, because of the very fact people are thinking in different terms today; they are thinking of conserving moisture and when you want to conserve moisture in an area, you do not put in a lot of open ditches.

MR. DENNISON: Do you feel the bill goes far enough at the present time?

MR. McEWING: I would not say it goes far enough, but I think it goes as far as we can travel. You have to have people educated to a certain extent.

There is one clause in this very bill we have under discussion now. Under the old Act, the maintenance of a ditch was awarded, or assessed rather, to the property owner, where the construction was assessed according to benefit. Now, we want the maintenance assessed according to benefits, not according to the property owners. That has been a very grave injustice in the past.

That is just one point that is in this bill. That is an example of the difference in thought today from what it was 40 years ago.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 40th Order.

MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE 40th Order, second reading of Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act," Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill

No. 120, "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act."

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill, as I said, which is a companion bill to the Ditches and Water Courses Act, and one which carries on from where that Act, to all intents and purposes, leaves off, and it can go into almost any magnitude in the way of expenditures.

Among the amendments suggested in this bill is one which provides that a person cannot connect lands to the drainage work where the lands have not been assessed for the work, except with the approval of the municipal council. The previous use of the word "adjoining" has led to difficulties in interpretation.

There is another change in connection with utilities, which is a reasonably important amendment. At present, the Act provides a procedure whereby when a drainage work or part of a drainage work is constructed in or about the property of a public utility, the utility shall be given the option of constructing that part of the work which is on or about its property and if it does not do so, it is liable, in addition to any other sums lawfully assessed under the Act, to assessments for the increase of cost of the work occasioned by the construction or operation of the utility.

These provisions are enlarged by this amendment to cover cases of repair made and maintenance as well as construction, and to provide for the assessment for increase of cost, even though the utility is not otherwise assessed under the Act. Provision is made for surveys of the property and the engineer's report, plans, et cetera on the utility, and for an appeal by the utility to the referee.

Those are the main amendments in this case. There is another regarding a situation where a boundary line of a municipality is encountered. At the present time it is difficult to interpret the reference to the point of entry into a municipality as the point at which the drainage work cross the boundary line between the road allowance and the lands in the municipality. In many cases there is no road allowance at the boundary or at the point where the work enters the municipality. The section as amended provides for all cases.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: Order No. 41.

PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 41st Order, second reading of Bill No. 121, "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act," Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 121, "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act."

I might say just a word explaining the change in this. One provision is that the Minister may grant a subsidy or assistance of 20 per cent. over $10,000 expenditure. Since my time in the Department of Public Works, I saw fit to give each and every applicant who made application and complied with the Act, the 20 per cent. assistance, and what we are doing in this case is lowering that amount from $20,000 to $10,000.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): $10,000 to $5,000.

MR. DOUCETT: Or, $10,000 to $5,000, I mean. That means, of course, in the future, any person who comes within the $5,000 scheme will get 20 per cent. of their whole drainage scheme, as they did on the $10,000 previously. That is the only change which amounts to much.

However, there is one other amendment we are suggesting there, Mr. Speaker, and that is that, heretofore where two schemes or two townships adjoined each other, and one scheme happened to be $10,000, or over, they got the assistance, or subsidy, whereas the scheme continuing the same drain, being probably under $10,000, could not be considered. Therefore, in the amendment we are making it possible so that

we may consider two schemes adjoining as one, and subsidize both.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 42nd Order;

POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 42nd Order; second reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act," Mr. Challies.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (PC Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act."

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) explain the changes in principle in this bill for us?

MR. CHALLIES: As I intimated on the introduction of the bill, there really is not any change of principle in the bill. It is a series of amendments carrying out new practices; for instance, the first clause you will find has to do with the appointing of a general manager. In the original Act, no provision was made for the appointment of a general manager.

I am giving you these explanations so you will see what a varied class of amendments there are.

The next clause has to do with the filing of the annual returns. Annual returns previously were simply filed with the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council; this provides the annual return of the Commission shall be filed in the regular way, and a copy shall go to the Provincial Secretary, who shall then file it with the Lieutenant-Governor and place it on the table.

Clause 3 has to do with the establishment of moneys, or the use of moneys in connection with the frequency conversion accounts.

There is a change of principle in Clause 4, which has to do with the setting up of an insurance fund complementary to our pension fund. That is the only difference of principle. You will find the next four or five pages are all regulations pertaining to the setting up and establishment of a pension and insurance fund. The employees' association agreed to that.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the clauses are all not related and if it is agreed upon, perhaps we could deal with them better in third reading and in Committee of the Whole. In the meantime, if any hon. member would like an explanation of any particular part of the bill and I can give it, I will be only too glad to do so.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I should like to avail myself of the opportunity to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) to enlighten the House on an amendment to the Act which was passed by the Legislature in March, 1947, but, which, to my knowledge, has never been implemented by this government or by the commission.

I would like to point out that when this amendment was introduced in the House on the 26th of March, 1947, by the then Premier (Mr. Drew), it was accompanied by a very lengthy speech, and—

MR. CHALLIES: Will the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) kindly let me know to what part of the Act he is referring?

MR. MACLEOD: I am referring, if you will just—

MR. CHALLIES: Well, let us have the particular part.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) dealing with this particular bill or something else?

MR. MACLEOD: I am dealing with the Power Commission Act. This bill contains a great many amendments to that Act, Mr. Speaker, and I would point out that hon. members of the House have no opportunity to raise the question of Hydro except when the hon. Minister in charge of Hydro (Mr. Challies) brings a measure before the House. I would suggest to you, Mr.

Speaker, the point I am going to make is not irrelevant to the bill we are now discussing. I have no intention of making a lengthy speech on it, but will rather confine myself to asking the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) whether the government has any intention of implementing the amendment introduced in March, 1947, which called for the enlargement of the Commission from five to nine members, and the inclusion on the Commission of a representative of labour, agriculture, housewives, and from northern Ontario?

What has the government or the commission done, to give effect to the amendment introduced on the 26th of March, 1947?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the commission consists at the present time of a chairman, a representative of the government in the person of the hon. member (Mr. Challies) who has just moved second reading of the bill, and Mr. Streith who was the president of the Ontario Municipal Electrical Association and who has been closely connected with the municipalities. They compose the commission at the present time, and there is no present intention of making any change there.

MR. MACLEOD: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, what was the purpose of this House passing an amendment which called for the enlargement of the commission to nine members two years ago, only to find now that nothing has been done about it?

MR. FROST: It was permissive legislation. I may say there has been a very considerable reorganization of the hydro set-up in the last year or so. No doubt there will be further reorganizations. It is a tremendous organization, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, and the changes in the set-up which have taken place in the last year or so are very far-reaching in effect, and I would say as time goes along there will be further changes and maybe the provisions of this Act will be implemented.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to prolong this debate, but I just want to say to the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) that when this amendment was introduced, it was certainly not presented to this House as just enabling legislation. The hon. Premier (Mr. Drew) was very explicit in telling the House the action called for in this amendment was going to be carried out. It is quite obvious now it was just a piece of "window dressing" and that the government never had any intention of doing anything about it.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call the House to order. We are dealing with the principle as presented in this bill. It seems now we have wandered off as to whether legislation passed last year or at some other time will be put into effect. I think the whole matter is quite irrelevant. We must confine ourselves to the principle of the bill which is immediately before the House.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Speaker, may I ask for an explanation on Subsection 10 of Section 4.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that should be dealt with in committee.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, there is no change in principle. There are a number of amendments which deal with matters relating to particular sections. I can assure my hon. friends there will be every opportunity given to discuss them in committee, when the particular sections can be considered.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, there are one or two matters upon which I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) to inform the House, and the rest of my discussion might take place in committee. One is the appointment of the general manager, and so forth. Are they putting forward this as an implementation of the recommendations in the Woods report?

The second question is will the pension scheme proposed be able to make use of the Dominion Government annuity plan, and are these annuities within the

scope of the Insurance Act, as suggested in the bill?

MR. CHALLIES: There is no provision for making use of the Dominion Government's annuities. Some of the local municipalities adopted that, but this provides for a pension and insurance, contributory both by the employees and by the commission. It is practically a straight life insurance policy. Does that answer your question?

MR. DENNISON: Then the bill is not broad enough to allow the hydro, if it saw fit, to make use of the Dominion Government's annuity plan as a pension scheme.

MR. CHALLIES: The pension, as it is provided now in the pension agreement, is set up by the commission in co-operation with the Employees Association, association for a pension, and added to that, by contributions by employees and the commission, is the insurance policy. They both go together. There is no provision, as far as I know, made to go into the question of Dominion Government annuities.

MR. DENNISON: You might get better rates.

MR. CHALLIES: The Dominion Government annuity is limited in the amount which can be paid. I think this is a comprehensive scheme, including all the employees, and we had better stick to the pension fund as we have it now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is another aspect to the hon. member's (Mr. Dennison) question.

MR. CHALLIES: What was it?

MR. DENNISON: Will the first proposal in this bill give you the authority to implement the Woods report?

MR. CHALLIES: He is carrying out the recommendations in the Woods report. We have the three men on the Commission, the Chairman, and the first and second vice-Chairmen, and then we have a general manager, and two assistant-general managers, one on administration, and one on construction. That is a recommendation in the Woods report. There is no provision in the old Act whereby we can appoint a general manager, and this includes the appointment of a general manager, together with a secretary, and so forth.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I think it is desirable that the legislation provide for the appointment of a general manager. At the same time, this legislation really relates to the Power Commission itself. The leader of the government (Mr. Frost) has pointed out there is a chairman and a vice-chairman, and one other member. I think in so saying, he might explain who was actually the Chairman of the Commission during the period of one year, between the time Dr. Hogg was fired, and the time Mr. Saunders took office? Who was the Chairman of the Commission during that period?

MR. CHALLIES: The vice-chairman acted in the absence of the Chairman.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It was a two-man Commission?

MR. CHALLIES: Referring to the question by the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis), I will be glad to explain that to him, and give him a full explanation of what it is, under the Act.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I presume No. 6, which pertains to frequency conversion —the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) would prefer that be dealt with in committee as well?

MR. CHALLIES: That is right.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I have two bills here, the Provincial Loan Act, and An Act to amend the Corporation Tax Act, which I should have liked to have considered in committee tonight. I think we have sufficient time to do that.

I move, Mr. Speaker, you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve

itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

MR. FROST: Order No. 28.

THE PROVINCIAL LOANS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 28th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend the Provincial Loans Act," Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 113 reported.

MR. FROST: 29th Order.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 29th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 115, "An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, 1939," Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L. Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, in connection with Section 3 of this amendment to the Act. I wish to say, first of all, I was not in the House when the bill was formally presented, but I want to congratulate the government and the officials of the Department for clearing up a great many difficulties which did exist in this Act.

Referring to Section 3 of the Act, it seems to me as though the government is not going quite far enough in providing for the application of the losses incurred by a new company against the profits subsequently earned.

MR. FROST: Upon which section is my hon. friend (Mr. Brown) speaking?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Section 4 deals with the same question.

MR. BROWN: It all deals with the same matter, I believe. Oh, I am sorry, that is Subsection 4.

MR. FROST: You are talking about Subsection 3?

MR. BROWN: I was talking about Section 4. I am sorry; I am in agreement with Section 3.

Section 3 agreed to.

On Section 4.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, this is a section to which I have some objection. I believe this section should comply with the provisions of the Income Tax Act as laid down by the Dominion Government, whereby they allow the losses, irrespective of whether the company, be a new company or an old company. My experience is that usually when a new company is formed, it is formed with sufficient capital to take care of a loss possibly for a year or two.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Not always.

MR. BROWN: I said "quite often." Whereas companies get into periods of depression, such as found many times in the 1930's, and they suffer losses. I think it is very advantageous that they should be allowed to offset their profits in subsequent years against those losses as well. I do not know whether it is the intention of the Department to, shall I say, creep before it walks.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. BROWN: I think this is a proper attitude, to see how it works, and if it works, it could be made to apply to the application of the losses against profits for all types of companies. If that be the case, I am satisfied. But I think that is a fair way of handling it.

MR. FROST: I may say that the hon. member (Mr. Brown) has raised a very interesting and a very important point there. We previously had not recognized this principle in our Act. Of course, it is in the Dominion Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is it in the Act of any other provinces?

MR. FROST: I assume it would be in the Acts of the agreeing provinces. I think that is so. I do not think the principle has been recognized in Quebec,

and, after all, our Act and our business organizations are of necessity working very closely with that province.

The situation is, that our tax is 7 per cent., and the Dominion's tax is 30 per cent. We initially felt that with a tax of 7 per cent., it was not large enough to justify a staff which would be necessary to take care of that particular problem. Therefore, we omitted the matter when we introduced the Corporations Tax Act, or the revision of the Corporations Tax Act, some time ago. We recognize the very valid argument in what my friend (Mr. Brown) has mentioned there. I can almost take the words from his mouth, and say we felt we had better creep before we walked in the matter, and we made it apply to new companies. We did that quite intentionally for the purpose of attracting companies to the Province of Ontario. I would assure my hon. friend (Mr. Brown) that this is not the last word. We are very much interested in this problem, and we will work this out. It is gradually going ahead, and will work out under the Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There are two points in connection with this section—or perhaps I should say Subsection 2 of Section 3. One is this: I presume the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has obtained an estimate, if that is possible—

MR. FROST: Very difficult.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Of what we may lose in corporation taxes as a result of this subsection.

MR. FROST: It is very difficult.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I appreciate that. Last year the revenue from corporation taxes was $58,000,000, or thereabouts?

MR. FROST: About $58,500,000.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is there no approximation of the amount involved?

MR. FROST: You must remember these were new industries.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, I realize it is an intangible, but, on the other hand, it is known how many new companies are filing returns in respect to last year. I would, therefore, think that the corporation tax officers would have some idea of what is involved, as far as the past year or two is concerned.

MR. FROST: As my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) knows, we are dealing with an intangible, so I think neither I nor my staff could do no more than guess. We think it is going to improve the picture. We are doing this because we think we will make something on it. We will get more industry here, and when they get going, and cease losing money, in the next year or two, we will get our "cut."

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not unsympathetic with that proposal at all. All I am suggesting is that the amount involved should be kept in mind, and perhaps the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would note it on the cuff, and give us some idea of what the amount involved looks like next year.

MR. FROST: I will be very glad to do that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I may say, that, contrary to the suggestions made by the opponents of the party which I lead, we are not unsympathetic to a device of this sort. If there are fields in which private enterprise is carrying the ball, I think there should be some device to encourage them in new projects, either from a taxing standpoint or otherwise, and if they are willing to do their job, I think we should give them the opportunity to "do their stuff."

MR. FROST: Mr. William Green says that they do that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, let us not fall back on Mr. Green. We are living in Canada, not the United States.

MR. MACLEOD: A very weak prop.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No matter what may be said by people outside of this country, the point is we are not unsympathetic to permitting new enterprises to enter this province, and this

is probably a legitimate tax weapon with which to attract them, subject to this; that it must be watched very closely, and I make the suggestion that next year the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) make a point to inform us how this thing has worked out, and also whether he intends to give it further consideration next year.

MR. FROST: I will be very glad to do that.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) said a moment ago that he got $58,500,000 from the corporation tax last year. Is that right? And last year, he gave us a figure of $50,000,000. Is that right? And you told me the other day that you did better than that, that you got another $1,000,000. I think you said it was $51,000,000.

MR. FROST: The average for the two years is $51,500,000, for the first and second year.

MR. MACLEOD: So it is possible this year you will pick up an extra million or so beyond the $58,000,000. Is that right?

MR. FROST: I will assure my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) that we will be glad to pick it up.

MR. MACLEOD: You got it last time, and it is possible, with your faith, you may get it again.

MR. BROWN: I think the $58,000,000 is not all from the 7 per cent. tax? Does it not include the corporation tax and the place-of-business tax as well, which might be considerable?

MR. MACLEOD: What is a million dollars to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost)?

HON. MR. FROST: About $50,000,000 is straight profit. May we revert to Section 1? I would like to strike out in Section 1, Clause (2) (jj), in that second line the words, "the provisions of Subsections 2, 4, 5, 6 and 6a of." The section then would read, "Loss shall mean a loss for a fiscal year computed by applying section 14." Thus, actually speaking, the section should apply and not the subsections. I move that Amendment. It is only a change in the wording.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are tidying up.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Should that not also apply to another clause in the Act?

HON. MR. FROST: You are quite right, that applies to section 4, 2 (f). My friend is very observant.

Section 1 as amended agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, if you take page 5, Clause 2, Subsection "f" in the seventh line, and strike out the words, "Subsections 2, 4, 5, 6 and 6a of," so that it then reads ". . . clause means the amount that results from applying Section 14."

Section 4 as amended agreed to.

Sections 5 and 6 agreed to.

Bill No. 115 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, if possible I would like to deal with Order No. 32, "An Act to Improve The Highway Improvement Act."

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

MR. FROST: Order No. 32.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 32nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act," Mr. Doucett.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, before this is carried, let us once again be clear about what is going to be done so far as the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is concerned. As I understand what the hon. Provincial Treasurer has said on this subject, the province is going to pay in cash, one-third of its

contribution to the municipality. Is that correct?

HON. MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am going to call on my good friend the Minister of Highways, who is very much more able to explain that.

HON. MR. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, to set at rest and to satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) I hope, for the future, I will put it in this way, that the government pays all subsidies to municipalities, in cash, and usually twice a year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: To be quite specific about it, I take it that means that if in 1949 the City of Toronto spends $4,800,000 on highway and road projects, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) said was estimated, the Provincial contribution will be $1,600,000, and that contribution will be made in cash and the other two-thirds will probably be debentures? Am I correct?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Department has on no occasion interfered with a municipality as to what they do with their part. That is a matter for them and the department of municipal affairs, but we will be paying, if this Act is passed, 33⅓ per cent. subsidy to the cities and separated towns and 50 per cent. subsidy to other towns and villages, paid in cash.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The important word is, "Cash."

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I said "in cash."

MR. JOLLIFFE: In the event Toronto proceeds with the $4,800,000 programme, the Provincial liability for 1949 will be $1,600,000 in cash.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: At last we have that cleared up.

HON. MR. FROST: Didn't I tell you, he could clear that up.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L, Waterloo North): Does this cover Capital as well as maintenance costs?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes, the municipalities present the Department of Municipal Affairs with the appropriation and when the proportion is approved it is paid on so much capital and so much maintenance, at the same rate.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF, St. David): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) tell us in the case of a suburban municipality around Toronto, what would their percentage be? Will they have 50 per cent?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I mentioned the other day, in introducing this bill, if you will remember, two municipalities, I think East York and York. Formerly they came under the same system as cities; that is, they were paid 50 per cent. of the two-mill expenditure and they now will be treated the same as the cities.

MR. DENNISON: 33⅓ per cent.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Yes.

MR. DENNISON: What is the present situation in regard to the Suburban Roads Commissions, of which I think there are only two? Does the city still pay a portion of the Suburban Road Commission's road costs?

HON. MR. DOUCETT: I may say the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) is entirely wrong on that. There are many, many Suburban Road Commissions in the Province of Ontario. In fact, practically every city in southern Ontario has a Suburban Road Commission.

The county contributes 50 per cent. of the cost of construction and maintenance of surburban roads, the county 25 per cent., and the urban municipality, whatever it may be 25 per cent.

MR. DENNISON: And that has not been changed by these grants?

MR. DOUCETT: No, there is no change.

MR. DENNISON: That is to say,

these grants are not applied for this purpose?

MR. DOUCETT: This amendment does not affect suburban roads in the least.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, just to allay any fears which may exist, would we be justified in assuming this clause of Bill No. 109, unlike the contents of Bills 107 and 108, does not infringe upon the autonomy and the right of the municipality? Would we be right in assuming that?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, I do not know whether you are right in assuming that, but I must say the municipalities I have heard from are very delighted with this amendment. In fact, a resolution some time ago was passed by the County of York asking that such a change be made.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) would admit, in the light of what he has just said, his explanation gives him a slight edge over the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) in the bid to get the leadership of the party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: "'Bye, 'Bye, Blackwell."

Sections 3 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 109 reported.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): You cannot say we are not co-operative.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): You have been very co-operative indeed.

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise and report certain bills with and without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain bills with amendment and certain bills without amendment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. Hon. members might bear in mind that tomorrow we meet at 1.30, and it is the intention to go ahead with bills tomorrow afternoon.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) could be a little more definite about that. I wonder if it would be possible for him to indicate what kind of bills he has in mind?

MR. FROST: If you will look at the order paper, Orders 43 to 55. Then we will take up private bills, and will go back into committee and complete these other matters. Would the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) suggest any change in that?

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): I was just wondering if we were ever going to come to private members' bills?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Well, the government programme is so heavy it is difficult to come to them.

MR. NIXON: Yes, but private members have a few rights, you know.

MR. FROST: Well, you see the private bills here.

MR. NIXON: The bills which have been introduced by private members on public matters, not the private bills.

MR. FROST: Well, I will give that consideration overnight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Pretty good.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I might say it is the present intention to have night sittings on Monday night and on Tuesday night. We have a lot of work to do, and that is the present intention.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. leader of the government (Mr. Frost) this question, is there any likelihood that, about ten days hence, after you have cleaned up the government legislation on the Order Paper, you may suggest to the House that the House adjourn and have a Session in the fall, and at that time we will deal with the public bills introduced by private members? Is that what you have "up your sleeve"?

MR. FROST: I do not think so.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is black-out time in the fall.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.17 p.m.

Vol. III, No. 27

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Friday, March 18, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 18, 1949.

City of Peterborough, bill respecting, Mr. Stewart, second reading 1037

Cornwall Street Railway, Light and Power Company, Limited, bill respecting, Mr. McDonald, second reading 1037

Village of Wasaga Beach, bill to incorporate, Mr. G. G. Johnston, second reading 1037

Canada Comforter Company Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, second reading 1037

City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Patrick, second reading 1038

Township of Etobicoke, bill respecting, Mr. Millard, second reading 1038

Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, bill respecting, Mr. Cathcart, second reading 1038

Canadian National Exhibition Association, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, second reading 1038

Township of Kingston, bill respecting, Mr. Pringle, second reading 1038

Town of Tecumseh, bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, second reading 1039

Telephone Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading 1039

The Legal Status and Boundaries of Municipalities, bill respecting, Mr. Dunbar, second reading 1039

Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading 1039

Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading 1040

Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading 1040

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading 1040

Marriage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading 1040

The Niagara Parks Act, 1949, bill respecting, Mr. Daley, third reading 1041

The Provincial Loans Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, third reading 1041

The Highway Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, third reading 1042

The Niagara Parks Act, introduced by Mr. Daley, third reading 1042

The Forest Management Act, 1947, bill to amend, Mr. Scott, second reading 1042

Forest Fires Prevention Act, bill to amend, Mr. Scott, second reading 1046

Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading 1046

Local Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, second reading 1047

Psychiatric Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Kelley, bill withdrawn 1047

Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1047

The Mining Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, bill reported 1047

Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway, bill respecting, Mr. Griesinger, bill reported 1049

Home for the Aged Act, bill respecting, Mr. Goodfellow, bill reported 1053

Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1058

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1949.

1.30 o'clock p.m.

The House met at 1.30 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 7th Order.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th Order; second reading of Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough," Mr. Stewart.

MR. H. A. STEWART (PC Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 8th Order.

CORNWALL STREET RAILWAY, LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY, LIMITED

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th Order; second reading of Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the Cornwall Street Railway, Light and Power Company, Limited," Mr. McDonald.

MR. J. L. McDONALD (PC Stormont): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the Cornwall Street Railway, Light and Power Company, Limited."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 9th Order.

VILLAGE OF WASAGA BEACH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 9th Order; second reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act to incorporate the Village of Wasaga Beach," Mr. Johnston (Simcoe, Centre).

MR. G. G. JOHNSTON (PC Simcoe, Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act to incorporate the Village of Wasaga Beach."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 10th Order.

CANADA COMFORTER COMPANY LIMITED

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order; second reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting Canada Comforter Company Limited," Mr. Rea.

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting Canada Comforter Company Limited."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 12th Order.

CITY OF LONDON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 12th Order; second reading of Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the City of London," Mr. Patrick.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No 11, "An Act respecting the City of London."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 13th Order.

TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 13th Order; second reading of Bill No. 17, "An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke," Mr. Millard.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 17, "An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 14th Order.

SARNIA YOUNG MEN'S AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 14th Order; second reading of Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association," Mr. Cathcart.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (PC Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 15th Order.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 15th Order; second reading of Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association," Mr. Rea.

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association."

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, just before this carries, I would like to say I believe this bill is a good one as far as it goes, but I do not believe it goes far enough. I am quite concerned and interested in the Canadian National Exhibition since a great part of it is in the constituency which I represent in this House. I believe that certain departments in the Exhibition need to have a great many more representative organizations included in their board. I am thinking particularly of the manufacturing and liberal arts sections of the Canadian National Exhibition which, at the moment, is totally unbalanced. None of the service clubs or home-and-school clubs are represented, nor is the Canadian Legion, but we have fifteen members of the Manufacturers' Association. This bill does aid that situation by adding to labour representatives. I hope in the future we may have a bill that will give us a better community representation at the Canadian National Exhibition.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 17th Order.

TOWNSHIP OF KINGSTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 17th Order; second reading of Bill No. 21,

"An Act respecting the Township of Kingston," Mr. Pringle.

MR. J. A. PRINGLE (PC Addington): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the Township of Kingston."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 19th Order.

TOWN OF TECUMSEH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 19th Order; second reading of Bill No. 27, "An Act respecting the Town of Tecumseh," Mr. Murdoch.

HON. W. GRIESINGER (PC Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Murdoch, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 27, "An Act respecting the Town of Tecumseh.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 67th Order.

TELEPHONE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 67th Order; second reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to amend The Telephone Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to amend The Telephone Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 68th Order.

THE LEGAL STATUS AND BOUNDARIES OF MUNICIPALITIES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 68th Order; second reading of Bill No. 128, "An Act for Quieting Doubts affecting the Legal Status and Boundaries of Municipalities," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 128, "An Act for Quieting Doubts affecting the Legal Status and Boundaries of Municipalities."

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) does not think this bill will remove all doubt about the status of municipalities, does he?

MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, no, I do not really think it will, but if you had the experience I had this morning of having a representation from the rural municipalities of the Province of Ontario in my office, who were so well pleased with everything that was being carried on by this government—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: One gentleman of the deputation said they are always jollying him because he is a Liberal. He said, "I am a Liberal, but I must admit this is the best government Ontario ever had."

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, he is sailing under false colours.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did you give him, George (Mr. Dunbar)?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 69th Order.

VITAL STATISTICS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 69th Order; second reading of Bill No. 129, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1948," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs):

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 129, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1948."

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, what is the main principle involved in this bill?

MR. DUNBAR: The main principle is that when we got out our form for the new Vital Statistics Act, which went into force on the 1st of July last, there was a duplication of what was on the marriage certificate. We are, therefore, putting everything on the marriage certificate and not sending out any forms. When persons go for a marriage certificate, they fill out all the answers to the questions and the clergyman is only required to sign his name and send it to the Department of Vital Statistics.

MR. J. A. PRINGLE (PC Addington): Mr. Speaker, they will still be able to get married, will they?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 70th Order.

PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 70th Order; second reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act."

I might say, Mr. Speaker, we wish this to go to the committee.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Which committee?

MR. DUNBAR: The Committee on Municipal Law.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 71st Order.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 71st Order; second reading of Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act."

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is this also going to the Committee on Municipal Law?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, I would also like this to go to committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 73rd Order.

MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 73rd Order; second reading of Bill No. 133, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 133, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." I would also like this to go to committee. In case some hon. members have not received notice, the meeting of that committee will be on Wednesday next.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 66th Order.

MARRIAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 66th Order; second reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend The Marriage Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend The Marriage Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 2nd Order.

THE NIAGARA PARKS ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 2nd Order; third reading of Bill No. 89, "The Niagara Parks Act, 1949," Mr. Daley.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 89, "The Niagara Parks Act, 1949."

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I had an amendment to that yesterday, that it be referred back to the committee, and section 9 be struck out.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): That was just a notice. Move it now.

MR. HOUCK: I moved it last night.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. member (Mr. Houck) moved it, and sent it in.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion was presented last night. I have sent for it.

MR. FROST: Has the hon. member (Mr. Houck) a copy of the amendment?

MR. HOUCK: I can tell you what it is.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that the hon. member (Mr. Houck) moved, seconded by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) that this bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, and section 9 should be struck from the bill. We are quite satisfied that was the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion was:

"Mr. Houck moved, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that Bill No. 89, 'The Niagara Parks Act, 1949,' be not read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend it by striking out section 9."

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the government cannot agree to that motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The vote is on the amendment to Bill No. 89. Call in the members.

The House divided.

The amendment negatived on division.

AYES: 38
NAYES: 47

MR. FROST: Then the motion is carried by the same vote.

Order No. 5.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Even though the amendment was defeated, the main motion should be put.

MR. FROST: I am advised that on a motion of that sort, the defeat of the amendment carries the main motion.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, we will talk it over at another time.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: Order No. 3.

THE PROVINCIAL LOANS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 3rd Order; third reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend the Provincial Loans Act," Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend the Provincial Loans Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the

bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: Order No. 5.

THE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 5th Order; third reading of Bill No. 109, "An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act," Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of bill No. 109, "An Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to revert to Order No. 2 and have the motion put, on the basis that once an amendment is defeated, it appears to me it is open to any other hon. member to move another amendment. If it is agreeable to the House, this can be carried on the same division, without taking a vote.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will revert back to Order No. 2.

THE NIAGARA PARKS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 2nd Order; third reading of Bill No. 89, "The Niagara Parks Act, 1949,"

HON. CHARLES DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 89, "The Niagara Parks Act, 1949."

MR. FROST: It can be carried on the same vote.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 74th Order.

THE FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT, 1947

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 74th Order; second reading of Bill No. 134, "An Act to amend the Forest Management Act, 1947," Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. H. R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests, Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 134, "An Act to amend the Forest Management Act, 1947."

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, may I just have a moment or two? I would like to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) speak on the principle of this bill.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I thought I had cleared that up, on first reading.

MR. OLIVER: Apparently you have not.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Have you read the amendment to the bill? Is there any point you have any doubt about?

MR. DENNISON: I will say what I have to say, and then the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) may like to add something to what has been already said. I was hoping that this amendment might have provided a little more indication of what the government intends to do with regard to forest management. As I see the picture of forest management, we are each year planting trees from nurseries. I noticed that last year we planted 734,000 nursery-raised forest trees, on crown lands, and the municipalities planted 9,215,000 trees, and the farmers, and other people on private lands planted the difference, to make the total 13,000,000 forest trees planted last year, most of this, I understand, red and white pine.

It seems to me the department is missing a chance here to really give us some more service in our forests by having people employed during the summer months to weed the existing forests.

I know in the district in which the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) lives, in the forests in that district, under the management of his department, there are many young trees starting to grow, and if the weed trees were weeded out, and species which have no value, be removed from them, and it would result in a very fine forest in a number of years. As I say, both red and white pine are in that district growing up beside willows and scrub poplars and many other species, which are of no value at all, and a few foresters spending perhaps half a day on an acre would remove these undesirable species, and give the good trees a chance to grow.

MR. PORTER: You want more red pine? You stick to the "red"?

MR. DENNISON: Yes, I was very much in favour of red pine, as well as white pine, Mr. Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), and there is a lot of this species in the constituency of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott).

MR. PORTER: Do you know the difference between the white and the red?

MR. DENNISON: Yes, I do know the difference. I can count the needles with anyone.

MR. MACLEOD: Will you explain the difference?

MR. DENNISON: The rule-of-thumb distinction between white and red pine is that the red has three needles, and the white has five. I noticed a lumberman the other day stated that in his opinion our white pine would be wiped out in 25 years at the present rate of cutting, due to the fact that we are not preserving existing stands of white pine.

In normal stands, these young seedlings start to grow in the shade of, say, the poplar trees, and so on, and the poplars die off in later years, and the white pine grows up and becomes a full-fledged tree. The department could preserve, in my opinion, thousands of acres of forests of white pine in this province if you did some weeding now; in your own constituency I would say there should be more than 13,000,000 white pine in that constituency alone which might be preserved, if you hired a gang of men to weed out the weed trees.

What is the use of this department planting 13,000,000 trees a year, and then neglecting a few thousand dollars per year to weed the existing forests, and permit the natural white pine to be conserved.

I make that suggestion to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott), and I hope he will take it in the spirit in which it is given.

I have been concerned for a long time with the depletion of our white pine forests, and the fact that forests which used to produce white pine today are producing all kinds of weed trees. The white pine would be able to grow, if it was given a chance. The second thing is in connection with cutting down the trees, even on private woodlands, the department should see there is one seed tree left for every acre at least, so that the natural white pine generation can take place.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to labour this bill at this time, but I would like to point out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) the opinion expressed by experts in this particular phase of our economy, including the Royal Commission Forestry, for the primary principle of pooling the resources in the forests, if we are going to make those forests serve us as they can. I would like to mention, just off hand, the level of the water, and its effect on hydro development, and the highways which are tied in with the forestry development, and the roads into the forests, and things

of that sort which enter into this particular phase in this province, and which are directly or indirectly tied up with them. These opinions are shared by others who know more about this particular question than I do, and the opinion is that you cannot get the full value of all these phases which are directly or indirectly tied up in the forests, unless you have a pooling arrangement for harvesting your forest. I mention that point, because the Royal Commission on Forestry was specific about the fact that the present licences should be cancelled, or at least set aside for ten years, and a new method of pooling and cutting set forward. When that is done, it gives you an over-all control of the forests, which, in my opinion, shared by many others, and you have to have a complete, controlled over-all picture which you cannot get under the present arrangement.

I am disappointed that this bill does not go further along that line, or does not give some specific answer to so many people to the effect that the set-up should be pooled, if you want to get the best out of these resources.

I had hoped the bill on forest management might give us some indication of the opinion of the government on the question of top diameter. There has been some very extensive experiments carried on in the United States, about which I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) is aware. I think there could be an enormous saving by cutting down the small top diameters, and any one who has lived in my part of the country and who has roamed in the woods, will be amazed at the number of tops left in the bush, which will have a full eight-foot stick at the top. Under the arrangements under this bill, some thought might be given to that, and I had hoped the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) might have told us what the opinion of the department was in regard to cutting down the top diameters, whether it is the intention to reduce the top diameter, and thus do away with this wasteful practise of leaving large tops in the woods. I have seen saw-logging operations in the bush, where they leave the pulpwood sticks standing in the woods, and not only the standing timber, but the sawn logs had the tops still on them. I still hope the hon. Minister might give some indication of what the idea is of his department, first, as to the pooling system of harvesting, and growing for future forestation, and on the question of diameters.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) replies, I would like to put a question to him. I cannot claim any great knowledge of white pine or red pine or any other pine. I confess to great ignorance. I would not want to put the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) in the position where he would have to go into any lengthy explanation.

However, the question in my mind aroused by this bill is one which effects the labour element in the cutting of our forests. This bill seeks to improve on an overall forest-cutting programme, and the department has not seen fit to include a representative of the men who actually know the situation, know violations of your rules and regulations in the administration of this law. I mean, the department has not included a representative of the organized woodcutters, of the lumber workers in its administration. If the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) has done that, then he has kept it a secret from us.

I want to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that some years back this House carried through all stages a bill calling for the establishment of a Forest Management Board, to be impartial and to operate quite independently of politics, such as the Hydro Commission. That Act, which passed through the House, was never proclaimed and the commission was never formed. When the bill was before the House, I think it was in 1944, I rose at the time to ask whether the government had intentions of including a representative of the organized lumbers workers in that commission, and if I recall correctly, the then Premier (Mr. Drew) implied, or almost

assured the House, that a labour representative would be included.

In the absence now of that commission, I do not believe any representative of the organized workers engaged in this industry are involved, or are given an opportunity to help in administering the Act in the best interests of the province as a whole. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that some consideration be given to this. I do not know how the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) can fit it in at this time, since the Forest Commission was not appointed, but it is something which should be done. These are the men who do the work. They are in the forests, they know what is happening, they know when regulations are ignored and more than is permitted is cut, and so on.

I think it would help the department and it would certainly contribute towards better forest management and the administration of the forestry law.

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I can always look for something constructive coming from the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), in fact, I expect him some of these days to write a book, "A Tree That Grew In St. Andrew."

MR. SALSBERG: Believe me, it is about time. You give me the seedling, and I will plant it.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I might say the officials in the department are employees in the woods end of it, they are men who have worked in the woods almost all their lives and are conversant with woods problems. We are constantly having conferences with industry, and occasionally with labour. In connection with the enforcement of our woods programme.

As regards the suggestion of the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) about top diameter; it is not necessary to bring in any legislation regarding top diameters. We already have legislation on the books and are working toward the end of enforcing it.

There is a reference to waste. Waste is something which it is very, very hard to define. Let us put it this way, if I were cutting hardwood trees 10 miles from the city of Peterborough and let the tops rot without cutting them into fuel wood, or left the large upper portion of the tree to rot just because it was too crooked and knotty, while having a market for that portion of the tree within 10 miles, that would be waste.

On the other hand, take a similar case in a place 100 or 150 miles from a market where that could be disposed of; it would not be waste to leave it there, because that is how our forest soil was built up in the first place.

MR. ROBINSON: I would agree with you on that.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I might say further with regard to that subject, we are having discussions at the present time with a branch of the Federal Government trying to arrive at some basis whereby we can definitely say what is waste and what is not. You can quite appreciate from your own experience of woods problems out there, it is hard to say what should be put down in the statute as constituting waste, because the types of areas and locations would cause it to vary.

I would like now to correct my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) in respect to something which I believe he said the other day in referring to operating companies, when he mentioned that the Royal Commission had mentioned Crown operating companies.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): No, no.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, might I correct that? There was a news item which referred to that, and if you read my speech in *Hansard,* you will find I did not state the Royal Commission on Forestry suggested Crown companies. I may add three years ago the CCF did, and a news item quoted me as saying that, but I have corrected it.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): That was brought to my attention this morning. I read it this morning and wanted to make sure.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That letter was all wrong.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I think I shall be discussing the matter with the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) and some other hon. members of the House very shortly with respect to the whole problem, and would like to leave any further discussion of that angle for the present.

Regarding "weed trees," I am not quite clear on what was said in this regard. I understood the hon. member for —one of the Toronto Saints—

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): St. David.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): St. David (Mr. Dennison). I do not know why they ever put Saints in Toronto, anyway.

Regarding "weed trees," I understood him to say they should be weeded out, and then to go on to say they provided shelter for the pine, the long-lived tree. I cannot quite reconcile his contentions in the matter, because we do look upon such "weed trees" as poplar and willow as protecting evergreens until they reach a certain height, and then the "weed trees" die out and enrich the soil.

MR. DENNISON: May I explain, Mr. Speaker? In the forest I am referring to, in the constituency of the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) a tree 5 or 6 feet away would do a young white pine good, because it would provide some shade. However, in many cases you will find this "weed tree" growing right beside a white pine, within 6 inches, a foot or two feet, and the limbs of the "weed tree" remove the leaders of the white pine, and as the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) knows, when a leader is broken off two or three times, the white pine has no chance of becoming anything but a scrub. I would suggest that you put a gang of men in each one of our forests in southern Ontario, where we have a chance of raising white pine, and, as the foresters say: "sneg off" those "weed trees" close to the young white pines.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST 75th Order.

FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 75th Order; second reading of Bill No. 136, "An Act to amend The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1948," Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 136, "An Act to amend The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1948."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 76th Order.

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 76th Order; second reading of Bill No. 140, "An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I may say I overlooked calling this order when the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) was in the House, when we were dealing with some other bills from his department. He found it necessary to go away for a few minutes, and asked me if I would move second reading for him for both this bill and the next Order, No. 77, the idea being that it is intended, and desired, that those two bills should go to the Municipal Committee with the other bills and therefore could all be considered at the same time.

With the permission of my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) opposite, I would like to move, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, second reading of Bill No. 140, "An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 77th Order.

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 77th Order; second reading of Bill No. 141, "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 141, "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: Order No. 63.

PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 63rd Order; second reading of Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend The Psychiatric Hospitals Act," Mr. Kelley.

HON. RUSSELL T. KELLEY (PC Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move that this order be discharged and the bill withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): I am in favour of that.

MR. FROST: We always like to please our friends opposite.

Motion agreed to; Bill No. 93 discharged.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Minister of Mines): 51st Order.

THE MINING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 51st Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 86, "An Act to amend The Mining Act," Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 4.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (CCF Temiskaming): Mr. Chairman, this is a clause which has created a lot of dissatisfaction among the prospectors in my area. While this bill was in committee, the Deputy Minister explained to me it had the endorsation of the Prospectors and Developers Association. While it is true this is an improvement over what it was before, nevertheless, it is the contention of the little prospector—and after all, one of the problems the Province of Ontario is up against today is that we have no "little prospectors." No individual prospectors. They are all working for some of the big mining companies. The little prospector is required, under this regulation, to drill two feet in order to get credit for a day's work. This simply increases the cost on the little fellow, who cannot afford it. The small drills they can pack in in a canoe to do the work on their claims, if they have to drill two feet in order to get credit for a day's work, it just makes it prohibitive. As I say, we have no "little prospectors" in the Province of Ontario today.

I think the Department of Mines is worried about that situation. I think they have given some study as to what is the best approach to the problem. I think the department might well be worried due to the fact of the failure of any inducement to the individual prospector today to do as old Sandy McIntyre and many of those old timers —Timmins, and so on—did in the early days, go out with a grub stake, stake a claim and develop it.

The X-ray has certainly made it more difficult to control, because many of these mining companies which have all kinds of assets in the form of money which they have gathered from their stockholders, hire these drillers and go out and do their assessment work by just drilling a hole at the side of a lake or any place. I feel some control is certainly necessary, but I do not think this is the correct approach. I do not think the correct approach to encourage

prospecting is to add the burden of an extra foot of drilling to the little prospector.

I had hoped the department would, as I suggested in committee, offer some assistance in the way of advising these prospectors where to drill. The danger the department apparently fears is that if you allow them one foot per day, they will just go out and do the foot that day and nothing will be developed. I do not think that is true of a genuine prospector.

I would suggest the department give more consideration to this problem and call in some genuine prospectors and not take your advice from Viola McMillan or The Prospectors and Developers Association, who, after all, only represent the big mining companies. You have a convention down here every year, supposedly of prospectors, and I can quite truthfully say I doubt if there are half a dozen genuine prospectors ever attend it.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has expressed some opinions in connection with this section which I think perhaps may not be far removed from the opinions of the Department of Mines in respect to some of the things he has said.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, this year a Mines Committee of the House was constituted, and the idea was to do just what my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has suggested in part, and insofar as we are able to do it in this House, to get the collective views on the matter.

After all, to be quite frank with you, I would not consider a section of that sort as a section which has any political implications. We are all anxious to do the best thing, and we called together a Mines Committee which my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) attended and expressed some of the views he has expressed now.

I think I could sum up what the committee said at that time, and I think it was discussed quite impartially, by saying this: I think we pretty well unanimously felt this section here did not cover all of the field we wanted it to cover. The difficulty was this, to get either a better alternative, which we could not find, or else to enlarge the scope of the section, and I think the consensus of the meeting was that this was a step probably in the right direction, and while it was not ample in many ways, we would feel our way along and would consider the problem next year.

I assure my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) we intend to call this Mines Committee every year, and intend perhaps to extend the work of the committee in many ways. I would like as many hon. members of the House as possible to know about the technical and other problems of that great department, and I may say this, that if we try this for a year, and it is not satisfactory, I can assure my hon. friends we will consider the matter next year, we will see what the operation is, we will try it out, and next year we will reconsider, if it is not satisfactory.

I agree with much of what my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has said about this. At the same time, this legislation tries to meet head-on a real difficulty we are running into in the mining areas, and I want to say our doors are not open only to the Prospectors' and Developers' Association, but they are open to everybody. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) knows we try to meet the reasonable suggestions that are made by people. I know last year, for instance, he very properly raised a point here relating to unguarded, opened and abandoned mining shafts up in his country. We tried to meet that situation, and I can assure him we will meet this problem in just as reasonable a way as that.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we should let this section go on. Let us try it for a year, and if it is not satisfactory at the end of the year, I will undertake with my hon. friends to reconsider it all at the next session of the House.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (CCF Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I

do not desire to cover the ground which has been covered by the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost), nor by the hon. member for Temiskaming (Mr. Taylor). However, I want to make this suggestion. We have this year started a new committee, the Mines Committee. I believe that committee can be a very useful one in this House, and I would suggest that before the House meets again, and before that committee meets in the next session of the House, prospectors and those interested be given an opportunity to appear before this committee, in the same way as they do before the Fish and Game and some of the other committees, such as the Private Bills Committee. We would then have a true view of the men who are doing the work in the field.

These prospectors may come to one or two of us who happen to come from that area, and voice their disapproval. How are we to know that is general amongst all the prospectors, or whether it is the disapproval of only one or two men? What we want to get is the collective ideas of the men who are doing the work in the field.

In my own mind, I believe there has been an injustice done the small individual prospector, but I am prepared to accept the hon. Minister's (Mr. Frost) suggestion, if he will assure us that next year we may have these prospectors here when the committee is meeting and discuss the question fully and completely with them at that time.

MR. FROST: Very glad to do it.

MR. TAYLOR: If I might be permitted to speak again, Mr. Chairman, I did intend to mention here to the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost), as I did personally the other day, the appreciation of the people in my riding for the manner in which the government undertook to do the fencing. This was another of those problems which, when I brought it up before the Mines Committee, the Act was not going to be changed and nothing was going to be done, but I am very glad to see the department has, regardless of the Act, undertaken to fence in the properties, the open cuts which are left as a hazard to some of our people, who have lost livestock and dogs in this way, and, in some cases, children have fallen into the cuts also.

They have done an excellent job of fencing this area, and I do want to express my appreciation to the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) for the work.

I want to add to what the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) has said, that I believe this Mines Committee of ours would be more serviceable if you could have sittings at various localities where these old prospectors could be notified and get out to attend the meetings and offer their suggestions.

We have old prospectors up there who are back in the woods 20 miles, and we never see them all summer, and when they come out in the fall they find new regulations have been made and they are upset about it. You would never get them down to the City of Toronto to present their views, you would have to get them in some local area near where they prospect.

I do hope the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) will carry out the sentiments he has expressed.

Sections 4 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 86 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 54th Order.

SANDWICH, WINDSOR AND AMHERSTBURG RAILWAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 54th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting The Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway," Mr. Griesinger.

On Section 1.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Chairman, this is rather an involved bill and I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), who probably has the most knowledge of anyone in the House, could give us some idea as to how the situation stands just now and how long the province is to be left "holding the bag."

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) is right. It is a very involved and difficult matter. However, I can assure the House first of all that this bill is the result of a great deal of collaboration with the municipalities concerned. The fact is, the bill was drawn by the solicitors of the various municipalities together with the representatives of the Treasury Department and the solicitor to the Treasury. I do not know of any point in this bill upon which there is any controversy between the departments, the government and the municipalities. I think these representatives are now in entire agreement.

To give you the background of the matter very briefly, I might say that this railway was created a great many years ago, probably 30 years ago, as a part of the old hydro schemes of that day to have hydro radials. Certain assets were purchased and incorporated in an electric railway linking the municipalities. As time went along, this railway became obsolete. That type of transportation went out of commission and actually the railway itself, owned by the municipalities was in hopeless bankruptcy. The municipalities were indebted, on bonds either to the government or to the public, and things were in chaotic condition. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) will remember when the previous administration was in power, passing certain legislation to rescue this railway from utter chaos through the Act which is now repealed by this particular bill. At that particular time Mr. Furlong, the solicitor in Windsor, was appointed chairman of the board. I can only speak with the greatest praise of Mr. Furlong's efforts in that great venture.

The old system has been done away with and it is now an up-and-coming transportation system in the line of buses and that sort of thing, and is now doing very well. It is making money and going ahead now. However, it still has very heavy financial obligations under this bill as it is.

I know my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) would want me, at this time, to mention the general principles of this bill, which are: to relieve the small municipalities, of which there are a number in the locality, La Salle, Riverside, Sandwich East, Sandwich West, Tecumseh and Ojibway of their indebtedness and obligations to us and to others. That is one principle.

The second is; to give them service while we relieve them of their obligations. At the same time these people have service there and trouble has been taken to assure them of good service.

The next thing is this; to make possible the ownership of this railway, ultimately, by the City of Windsor, as it has put of lot of money into it and they have been paying on their tax rate large amounts of money every year. This provision is going to give them immediate relief on obligations they are presently meeting there through tax rates. I am unable to say what reflection it might make on the tax rate. The hon. member who introduced this bill (Mr. Griesinger) could probably give better information on that than I. At the same time we are giving quite considerable provincial relief now. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) may say, "How much are you paying from the provincial coffers in connection with this, and why?" I would say it is now an asset. It is worth some money. It is not left as a dead loss to the province. I think that is correct.

On the other hand, there were efforts made to do that back in the days of—I do not know whether it would be in the days of the first government in which my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) was—

MR. NIXON: Yes, it was.

MR. FROST: I do not know whether that government started hydro radials—

MR. NIXON: No, we are the government that stopped them, but nevertheless—

MR. FROST: I was coming to that. However, it was the government of that date who interfered with hydro, and very properly. I have no objection or disagreement with what was done at that time. I think, if the government of that day had not interfered, we would have had a difficult problem.

MR. NIXON: We had about fifteen problems similar to this.

MR. FROST: They did something in that day which interfered with hydro and they did right for the people of this province. At one time it was going to be in a position to cause a lot of trouble in this province.

I do not know whether I can give you this complicated picture in any understandable way, but I think this is about the situation. The municipalities, other than Windsor, are to be reimbursed for moneys paid to the extent of about $82,000. I will give it in round figures. These are La Salle, Riverside, Sandwich West, and Tecumseh. These municipalities are to get back what they have put into it, some $82,000. On the other side of the picture, one of the townships down there, I think it is Sandwich East, owes a little bit of money because of some adjustment, an amount of $1,031.31, and we wrote that off so they are out of the picture.

We cancel and return to those municipalities I have mentioned, debentures which are held collaterally in this deal to the extent of $1,141,000. We also cancel debentures which Windsor has issued and which held themselves collaterally to certain obligations with the province to the extent of $1,045,000. These are cancelled.

Here is what we really do. The indebtedness to the Province of Ontario—my hon. friend (Mr. Griesinger) will correct me if I am wrong—is $3,481,-036.49. We wrote off in this deal $481,036.49. This is a relieving of their obligations at the present time of that much money.

On the other hand, the railway itself issued a new bond issue of $1,500,000, interest at 2 per cent. and they are to be dated July 31st, 1948. The City of Windsor issued a new issue of the same kind in the same terms and that cancels our indebtedness except for the fact that there is held by the public the sum of $3,000,000 in debentures and that $3,000,000 which is held as debentures under the agreement, the City of Windsor is to service those debentures until the date of their expiration in 1960, and pay the interest on them. However, at the time they come due, the province pays $900,000 of the amount, the City of Windsor pays $2,100,000.

Now, that is as concise a statement as I can give of a very complicated transaction. This bill has been drafted after collaboration with the municipalities and I do not know of any item in relation to it that is outstanding or upon which there is any disagreement.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Everything the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has told us today is quite true. The City of Windsor and adjacent municipalities have tried for years to get a proper assessment of this Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway. It was definitely an injustice at the time of amalgamation to have that $5,500,000 in the debt hanging over the heads of Windsor and other municipalities for years. This a very fine piece of legislation, it is something very long overdue. I would like to congratulate the government on bringing this bill in and I would like to take this opportunity of thanking our Mr. Speaker and the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Griesinger) for trying to get this matter straightened out.

There is only one thing which occurs to my mind and I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has more or less answered that. This bill provides that in the event that the road should sustain financial loss, the City of Windsor will be liable. In view of that I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), can he tell us at what time the line will be returned? In asking that question, I am not in the least trying to create the idea that the railway is not efficiently operated at the present time. The management is very fine, due to the fine co-operation which exists between management and employees. I do think in the near future the management of the road should come back to the City of Windsor. Can the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost)

give us some definite time that this might happen?

HON. WILLIAM GRIESINGER (PC Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Chairman, the basis upon which the balance is being paid works itself out in 1978. That would be the actual time when there would be no indebtedness to the railway and it would belong to the City of Windsor. However, there is nothing to prevent the City of Windsor, in some intervening year, if they are in a position to assume ownership of the railway, from doing so. The actual debts will be paid off in 1978.

I might point out on this schedule here, that the city, starting in 1951 or 1952, up to 1957, pay an average of $500,000 on that debt commencing in 1949. The total is $50,000 in principal and $30,000 in interest, or $80,000 a year until 1976. I think you will recall that the mayor of the City of Windsor said in a press release to the *Windsor Daily Star,* that it should mean a reduction of 4 or 5 mills in the tax rate in the particular years when the big demands are answered.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the hon. Minister, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), even at this late date, admit that the U.F.O. Government of this province, back in 1919 to 1923, saved Ontario from a very heavy financial blunder when they stopped the building of these hydro radials. This is the first time I ever heard a member of his party admit that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. CHALLIES: Wrong as usual.

MR. FROST: We are always glad to accept good which comes from the opposition. We do get a few rays.

MR. DENNISON: I am glad to hear that tribute paid to the old U.F.O. Government, which I consider one of the greatest governments this province ever had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: Even in deciding to stop these hydro radials, they did not rush in without the advice of experts and interfere with hydro. They appointed the Royal Commission who heard experts on hydro, and it was only after the most thorough hearing of the experts, they decided to abandon the hydro radials.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Did it take them four years?

MR. DENNISON: It did not.

MR. FROST: I am glad the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) is satisfied with his own explanation.

MR. H. A. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Chairman, if I may be pardoned for saying one word, I am very interested indeed with the explanation the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) gave. I am not a sufficiently financial genius to go through this bill, and get that out of it myself.

I recall very well indeed, about 29 years ago, when we were first faced with this problem, it was extremely embarrassing to the government of the day. The hydro, and the government of Sir William Hearst had already committed the province to very great indebtedness, and Sir Adam (Beck) was still very enthusiastic about these radials, and at that time was pressing vigorously to have them proceed. It just shows you how easy a government can start something that may be very costly. This even now sets it forward to 1978 before we will see the last of the payments of this disastrous venture. It may have appeared to be sound in its initiation, but certainly when the time came, with the good roads we were able to build, there was an end of the old radial era, and as from then on we were going to travel by motor car on good roads, it was obvious it would be a mistake to proceed with this scheme.

I wonder if the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore—was that cleared up by different legislation, or is it still in the air?

MR. GRIESINGER: I do not recall at the moment.

MR. NIXON: That was another hydro radial. It may have been cleared off.

MR. CHALLIES: I think you will find they are all incorporated into one.

MR. NIXON: From the very start the Hydro Commission stood between this government and these municipalities, and guaranteed the bonds.

MR. FROST: They "fangled" around, until they got out from under it, anyway.

MR. CHALLIES: They were good "fanangalers."

MR. NIXON: I believe it was done while I was a member of the government. Just how they got out from under I do not recollect. It seems to me at one point they advised the government they would not have anything more to do with it, and withdrew their guarantee. Whether that was accepted by the government and confirmed by the Legislature I do not know, and I have no immediate information available.

MR. MacLEOD: The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) must have been their lawyer.

MR. NIXON: I would be very glad, if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) knows how the hydro got out from under, in connection with their definite guarantees which they gave, which Sir Adam Beck assured the government would absolutely protect the Province of Ontario against any loss if these radials did not turn out to be the bonanza—as he thought they would—if he would tell us.

MR. FROST: I will look that up, and if there is any chance of giving that information, I will do so.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Chairman, if I may say just one word. I do not want to question anything the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Griesinger) has said, in view of the fact that he has informed us it will result in a reduction of our taxes. I do want to question that, however, a little, because I am informed by the financial people of the city of Windsor that some of the bills put through at this session will result in a loss of $75,000 to the City of Windsor, so the reduction may be offset by some of this legislation.

MR. GRIESINGER: I merely am quoting the statement from Mayor Rheume.

MR. FROST: By the time this bill and some of the other legislation pending goes through, Windsor will not have any tax rate.

MR. DUNBAR: This has been checked over, and if you people with authority in the City of Windsor do not pass it on to the ratepayers, you will have to answer for it, because we are handing you a 5-mill reduction.

MR. ELLIS: Yes, but do not take it away from us again.

Section 1 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 14.

MR. SALSBERG: This being the last section, I think it would be proper for this House to express appreciation to this company, for being the only street railway company which gives the hon. members of this House free passes. May the other street railways take a lesson from that, and they will also get an expression of appreciation.

Bill No. 117 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 55.

HOME FOR THE AGED ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 55th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 110, "The Homes for the Aged Act, 1949," Mr. Goodfellow.

On Section 1.

MR. DENNISON: I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) who introduced this bill, if it was the intention of the bill when introduced, to apply to homes for the aged run by religious or private insti-

tutions. I will tell you why I ask that question. In my riding we have the House of Providence on Power Street, and they intend to build an extensive addition in the next few years, and they would like to be able to get the benefit of some of these grants, and would like to be able to get the benefit of assistance under the Act.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, may I advise the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) that it is not the intention to make these capital grants to private institutions. They will only apply to public and municipal institutions.

MR. SALSBERG: I spent some time on this bill on second reading, and especially on this point, namely, the omission from the bill to provide benefits to private institutions such as the one the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) mentioned.

I might add I communicated the fact that this bill is before the House to a number of those private institutions, and I was wondering whether the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) would agree to hold the bill back so as to give representatives of these institutions, of all religious groups, an opportunity to appear before him, and discuss this aspect of the bill. I think it would be a correct and proper thing to do. They will undoubtedly want to make representations to the government in the hope that the bill will be widened to provide benefits also to private institutions. Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) agree?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, I might say it is not the policy of the government at this time to make capital grants to assist in the building of private institutions. We think this is a very important step, and that it helps the municipalities to have some co-operation, when it is required. We feel we are making a very nice gesture in providing assistance to the municipalities in the construction of homes for the aged.

MR. MACLEOD: I would like to ask this question, Mr. Chairman. Why does the government make a distinction between the homes for the aged and the hospitals? The government does make capital and maintenance grants to hospitals which are conducted by religious organizations and private organizations, and I find it a little difficult to follow the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) when he says so categorically that the homes for the aged stand in a different position. I would think myself, if the government is anxious to provide accommodation for the increasing number of aged people, one of the best ways to achieve its heart's desire would be to give a capital grant to existing institutions which may be in a position to build additions and annexes to existing homes, and thereby be able to cope with this problem, in a much shorter space of time than if you leave it to the municipalities.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) I think admits that in the case of Toronto there is no municipal institution. The City of Toronto does not have a home for the aged. The hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) told us the other day he is anxious to have the municipalities accept their obligations and responsibilities in that direction. There may be something to that, but I fear it will take rather a long time, and I would like, in closing, to repeat my question; why does the government draw a distinction between giving grants to hospitals, and grants to homes for the aged which are maintained by religious organizations and others?

MR. GOODFELLOW: In reply to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) I might say that I do not think there is going to be much hesitation on the part of most municipalities to go forward with our conception of what constitutes a proper home for aged people. I may say to the hon. members of this House that we have been more than surprised and delighted at the response we have had to the introduction of this bill into the house.

Dozens of municipalities have already indicated renewed interest. We have already had five boards of management from various municipalities in the Pro-

vince of Ontario in to see me in person, and I feel the municipalities, by and large, of this province will welcome these new grants, and also the fact we are giving 50 per cent. towards the net maintenance.

I think that is as far as we should go, that we should encourage municipalities to assume their responsibilities towards the building of institutions. As I said when this bill was up for second reading, a great deal of credit is due to members of private organizations and religious welfare organizations in this province for the splendid homes they have operated, but at the same time, I think I pointed out there are some homes which are far from desirable which are being operated under private organizations. I do not think the government should encourage new construction. After all, this bill, as you know, calls for capital grants to be made for new constructions or for additions to existing homes for the aged. I do not feel at this time we should give consideration for making grants to private institutions. I do not think it is good policy, at least until the municipalities assume their responsibilities and go along with us in trying to develop what we have in mind in respect of what should constitute a home for the aged.

MR. MACLEOD: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) permit just one more question? I understand the City of Toronto has purchased from the Dominion Government, Christie Street Hospital and intends to convert that into a home for the aged. May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) whether it is the intention of the government to make a grant to the City of Toronto to help in the maintenance of that institution?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, that is a matter to which I will have to give consideration, but at the present time my reaction would be that we would not make a capital grant towards the purchase of Christie Street Hospital as a desirable place for aged people. We feel it would make an excellent factory.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): You feel what?

MR. GOODFELLOW: We feel it would make an excellent factory.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, that is how we feel, too.

MR. MACLEOD: I was not advocating it, I was just asking.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Oh, I thought you were advocating it.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): One has to be careful here. I rise again to make it abundantly clear that I consider this bill a step forward, and said so when we discussed it in second reading. However, I do suggest the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) overlooks a very important point in considering homes for the aged.

In principle, I agree with the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) and the government that they should be government institutions, but in reality—and I submit for a very long time to come—there will be not only a need of, but there will actually exist, religious and national institutions of this sort, and I would not speak lightly of them. I can understand an aged person of a certain religious conviction feeling more at home in an atmosphere of an institution that is perhaps operated by a group he is associated with and continue his pattern and way of life. I think it would be wrong to deny these elderly people such an opportunity. It would be wrong, I suggest, to compel them to go to a municipal or government-operated institution exclusively. That applies to those of the Catholic faith, the Protestant faith and other faiths equally as well.

I think it is true, and while the immediate interests of the government may be to establish only county homes and municipal homes, then I say we are all behind the government in this effort and in this desire, but we suggest there is also room for making plans to include existing institutions that are provided and are of religious or national character.

Insofar as the inadequacy or the level

of some of these private institutions is concerned, I am not prepared and I do not argue that all of them are endowed with the qualification to be desired, and I want to say if this government were to establish a minimum standard for all homes for the aged, then they would safeguard the aged people and would also make grants only—

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman—

MR. SALSBERG: —to such institutions as live up to the standards.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg), but all this is out of order and has nothing to do with the bill. This bill does not go as far as my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) suggested. That is a matter which might have been considered on second reading, but after all, the government has to accept the responsibility of putting forward legislation here which is going to help municipal homes. There is nothing to be gained at this stage of things in discussing other homes. There may be an argument, but this is not the place for it.

The point is this, as to whether these sections here are to be passed by the House or not. I do not like to cut my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) short, but—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: —this is neither the time nor the place to deal with that particular problem.

MR. SALSBERG: I grant, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) is technically correct, but I think it is a good deed and worth trying twice. My sole effort was to get the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) perhaps to postpone the bill a few days to give them an opportunity to appear.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: If you refuse, of course, we will have to proceed.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. JOHN G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, is my understanding correct that this does not interfere with the composition of the Board as it is at present constituted in, shall we say, in the City of Kitchener, where they have a five-man board now, as long as it meets the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council?

MR. GOODFELLOW: That is right. It does not interfere in any way with the appointment of boards of management. They will be appointed the same as they are now, by the municipalities.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (CCF Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, under Section 2 of the Act we have the method under which these homes are established in counties. Under Section 3, is set out the method by which it is intended to establish these homes in districts.

Under Section 3, only one home may be established in each district. That is, down here in old Ontario, you can establish these homes in towns, townships and cities but in northern Ontario, in great extensive areas, we are limited to one home per district. Some of the districts in northern Ontario will extend for several hundreds of miles. That means people who are committed to these homes are taken 200 or 300 miles from their homes, and it is impossible for their relatives to visit them or call on them, as is possible with those who are committed to homes in southern Ontario. I was wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) had considered that point in drafting Section 3—that is, whether or not it would be permissible in districts to have one or two homes in different parts of the district?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for South Cochrane (Mr. Grummett) has brought up a very good point there, especially in connection with his area. I spent a day in Timmins meeting representatives of the various municipalities there, and I do feel there is some merit in the suggestions put forward at that meeting,

especially in relation to that particular area.

It may not apply to any other districts in northern Ontario, but perhaps there should be consideration given to the erection of more than one home.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is correct.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

On Section 5.

MR. GOODFELLOW: In connection with Section 5, at the present time this does not give just the meaning which we intended it to give, and I would like to have this deleted, and I move that Section 5 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"Notwithstanding Sections 2 and 3, the council of any municipality not having a home for the aged or a joint home for the aged, may, with the approval of the Minister, enter into an agreement with the council of any municipality having a home for the aged, or the councils of any municipalities having a joint home for the aged, or the board of any home for the aged in a district, respecting the admission thereto and the maintenance therein of residents of a municipality coming within the classes of persons mentioned in Section 11."

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question with respect to that revised section? Does that allow a municipality where there is presently a privately run home for the aged to take out a scheme whereby they become a part of the new home? What I have reference to is in some circumstances, particularly in my riding, where there is a home for the aged run by a private group of people, it is badly run down and certainly should be replaced with a more modern structure, but it is not owned by the municipality.

Is there some way under this revised section that the municipality can get together with this private institution and construct a proper home for those people—a joint co-operation of municipality and private group?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No, Mr. Chairman. What this section means is; if the City of Windsor, for instance, did not propose to build a home of their own, they might under agreement with, say, the County of Essex, arrange that the County of Essex might build a home with sufficient accommodation for the people of Windsor, who might need to go into that home.

This does not deal with the case of a municipality entering into agreement with a private organization to take over the home. That is something the city itself would have to decide with the organization.

MR. ELLIS: I see.

Section 5 as amended agreed to.

Sections 6 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 15.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Chairman, on 15, in the case of municipalities where they draw the main source of their revenue, or all their revenue, from the old-age pension; the inmates of the House of Providence, I am told, receive $25 a month, and from that $25 they have to supply medicine and clothing as well as meals.

Now, Mr. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) they say they are losing so much on each person per day—from 2 cents to 5 cents per day on each person, and they run that place very economically. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) could see to it that in cases of this kind the pensions are raised enough to at least permit the institutions not to take a loss.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, the particular institution to which the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) referred is a private institution, and they are getting $33 a month on all old-age pensioners at the present time. This particular bill has no reference whatever to the maintenance of inmates in a private institution.

MR. DENNISON: They are getting $33 you say?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes.

MR. DENNISON: They tell me they just take $25, and the pensioner gets the rest. Is the amount they take from the pensioner set by the department?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No, that is worked out by an arrangement between the pensioner and the institution. However, we do make suggestions to them, and we suggest that they should not take the whole pension, as we feel the pensioner should have some money left for his own use.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): Have these people made representations to you for an increase in the portion you allow them?

MR. GOODFELLOW: That is entirely outside of this bill. What the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Leavens) is speaking about is increasing the amount paid to inmates in private institutions. This bill is dealing in connection with public institutions.

Sections 15 and 16 agreed to.

On section 17.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, I would move in connection with Section 17, that it be amended by adding thereto the following clause:

> "(h) Providing for the admission to homes for the aged of residents of unorganized territory, and prescribing the manner of computing the cost of maintenance of such persons in homes for the aged"

and then the present subdivisions lettered "h" and "i" be re-lettered and be subsections "i" and "j."

MR. CALDER: I see there is no provision in this bill as to when it will become law. Normally, then, it will sometime in May put the municipalities under an obligation to build. I know there must be a certain amount of flexibility in these things, and I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) if he would be good enough to indicate the building programme he has in mind, considering the urgent need for this type of building and considering the present high cost of construction?

MR. GOODFELLOW: That is up to the municipalities. It is entirely up to them. When they go ahead, we will make the grant available to them. There are one or two municipalities at the present time where construction has already started.

Sections 18 and 19 agreed to.

Bill No. 110 reported.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report certain bills with amendment, and certain bills without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs leave to report certain bills with amendment, and certain bills without amendment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) indicate his plans for Monday?

MR. FROST: We are going ahead with government bills which are on the order paper, and it is also our intention to go ahead with Estimates, and I think the hon. members should now be prepared to consider any Estimates which may be called.

We want to get ahead, and I would like the hon. members to be prepared to discuss any of the items when they come up.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) said some time last week he would indicate to us in advance what departments would be called. In line with that, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) give some indication of what will be called on Monday,

recognizing that you cannot know the whole schedule.

MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) that we find that is difficult and inexpedient. If there are cases where we can give consideration, we will be glad to do so, but I would not want to feel bound that we had to do it, because, after all, we must get ahead with the business of the House.

MR. MACLEOD: I was thinking of Monday.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) will do the best he can in that regard?

MR. FROST: I always aim to satisfy.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There may be the odd case we would be more happy to go ahead with on the Estimates if we had the answers to certain questions. However, we may get them next week.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.36 o'clock p.m.

Vol. III, No. 28

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Monday, March 21, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 21, 1949

Resumption of Adjourned Debate, "The Fire Departments Act, 1949," Mr. Park .. 1063
Teachers' Superannuation Act, bill respecting, Mr. Porter, second reading 1075
Act Respecting the City of Toronto, introduced by Mr. Rea, debate adjourned 1094
Act Respecting the City of Ottawa, introduced by Mr. Chartrand, second reading . 1095
The Police Act, 1949, introduced by Mr. Blackwell, second reading 1095
The Companies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1114
The Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1116
College of Art Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1117
Continuation Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1118
High Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1118
The Public Libraries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1118
The Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1119
The Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1119
The Teachers' Boards of Reference Act, 1946, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1119
The School Sites Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, second reading 1120
The Change of Name Act, 1948, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, second reading 1120
An Act to Provide for the Consolidation of Regulations Filed Under the Regulation Act, introduced by Mr. Blackwell, second reading 1121
The Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, second reading 1121
The Companies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, second reading 1121
The Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, second reading 1121
Resolutions—Mr. Challies, Mr. Porter, Mr. Blackwell, agreed to 1122
The Marriage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, bill reported 1122
The Telephone Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, bill reported 1126
Quieting Doubt, introduced by Mr. Dunbar, bill reported 1126
The Vital Statistics Act, 1948, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, bill reported 1126
The Athletics Control Act, 1947, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, bill reported 1126
The Tile Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, bill reported 1127
The Ditches and Watercourses Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, bill reported 1127
The Municipal Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, bill reported 1127
The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, bill reported 1127
The Power Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Challies, bill reported (except section 4) 1127
Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, bill reported 1129
Children's Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, bill reported 1132
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1133

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

MONDAY, MARCH 21, 1949.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 50th Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 50th Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 107, "The Fire Departments Act, 1949," Mr. Blackwell.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate on The Fire Departments Act, I would like to re-state some of the views which have been expressed from this side of the House as to why we feel the bill should not be passed at this time.

It seems to me that since this bill was first introduced we have had three different explanations from the government as to the reasons for the bill. First it was presented to us as a part of government fiscal policy; then we learned, from the press, and subsequently in the Legislature, that it was a kind of defence measure, with standardization being one of the desirable features; and finally, we learned from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), when he spoke in the debate here, that the protection of collective bargaining rights and working condition rights of the firemen was an issue at stake.

I would like to say first of all that no one objects to the desire to achieve standardization. Certainly no one in this group holds that view. We believe that there is a need for the supervision and the standardization of fire equipment in this country, and I do not think we need to take second place to anyone in the desire to protect the rights of collective bargaining. Our objections to this bill are that, first, the municipalities have not had time to discuss the bill, have not had an opportunity to meet with the Cabinet and work out their objections, as they have been expressed by the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves, and by some of the individual municipalities. They have not had an opportunity of discussing the matter at length with the Cabinet and attempting to work out a solution to their objections. Again, we do not believe that any system of piecemeal grants to municipal bodies is an alternative to any all-in municipal - provincial conference in settling the question of municipal finance.

We feel that if grants are to be made, then those grants ought to be made in those areas where the municipalities have asked for them, in the field of welfare rather than the fields of the Fire Department and the Police Department, such as are proposed in this bill.

Another feature we object to is that grants based on expenditures as such are bad. I think we are repeating here the mistakes which have been made in the Department of Education grants,

and which were aired earlier during this session.

Finally, we object to the grant technique as a manner of control of these essential departments of municipal affairs. I think the government could achieve standardization—if that is its object. There is one principle method I think they could have tried. They could have sought, and I am sure obtained, the voluntary co-operation of the municipalities in achieving standardization. I do not think that has been tried at all. I am sure those here have sufficient confidence in our municipal governments that, if the issue were placed squarely before them, that there was need for standardization, it would be quite easy to work out a programme of standardization. I suggest to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and the government that the collective bargaining rights, about which they are so concerned, could well be protected by placing all municipal workers under the full term of the Ontario Collective Bargaining Code and establishing for them the same rights as workers in industry generally obtain, and then this issue of protecting the firemen's rights by a special Act would not need to come before us at all.

However, the major objection stems from Section 14 of the bill, which places in the hands of the Fire Marshal great rights, and from whose decision there is apparently no appeal. Section 14 establishes that the Fire Marshal shall examine the statements from the municipalities and if he is satisfied with the correctness thereof, he shall so certify to the Treasurer of Ontario, and then the Treasurer of Ontario is entitled to act—only if the Fire Marshal of the Province of Ontario is satisfied or pleased with the way the municipality has carried on in the handling of its fire department affairs.

In view of the tremendous number of protests which have been received—and I know there has been some attempt over the week-end by the government to meet those protests by suggesting that there may be some subsequent changes made in committee and so on—in view of the large number of protests which have been received, we are asking the government to hold back this bill for further consideration until the municipalities have had an opportunity to discuss in detail with the government the provisions of the bill. I am quite sure if that were done, the desire of the government to establish standardization, the desire of the government to protect collective bargaining rights could be worked out without getting most of the municipal councils in this province "up in the air," as they have been recently as a consequence of the action of the government in introducing this bill without any prior consultation.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (PC Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the hon. gentleman over there (Mr. Park). I have just received a wire from Renfrew. Renfrew belongs to the International Association of Firefighters. We have local 996 down there, which includes most of the firefighters in the Ottawa riding, in fact, the City of Ottawa belongs to this local. The wire reads as follows:

> "Renfrew Firefighters Association, Local 996, International Association of Firefighters heartily endorse the proposed Fire Department Act, 1949, and earnestly request your support of this bill."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member (Mr. Park) a question?

MR. PARK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Dempsey) take his further direction on other legislation from the Fire Department local in Ottawa from today on?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Pardon me?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR

(PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): What was that about the local Fire Department in Ottawa? I want to say, I received a wire from the Fire Department in Ottawa too, endorsing word for word just what my friend, the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey) has stated.

AN HON. MEMBER: A live wire, George?

MR. DUNBAR: And some other unions also you might perhaps not agree with. I do not think you are a union man at all, by your actions here.

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not think, period.

MR. DUNBAR: What you are is a leech taking the blood from the working man.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. D. NAULT (PC Russell): Mr. Speaker, I also received a telegram from the Fire Department of Ottawa, and they were in favour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. T. GORDON (L Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram from the Brantford Fire Department, asking me to endorse this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. L. EASTON (CCF Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram also from the Hamilton Fire Department's local asking me to support the stand on this, but I do not take my orders from locals of unions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. EASTON: I am here as a legislator.

AN HON. MEMBER: You follow the party line, eh?

MR. EASTON: I believe the place to take your orders from is the local council of the municipalities, who are responsible for enforcing and administering those municipalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the hon. Attorney-General was on his feet. I have been giving way to various members to make short statements.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): The only thing is, Mr. Speaker, I take it if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is going to speak now, having spoken once, he is going to close the debate. If that is so, I think he would be glad to postpone his reply until he has heard from these hon. members. I may be wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: I will be glad to give way, provided the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is willing. I have acknowledged the hon. Attorney-General, but, after all, if he is willing to give way and allow various members to make brief statements, I am perfectly willing.

However, I think we must follow the rules of procedure. It is entirely up to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) whom I did recognize, I think, before hon. members on this side of the House. It is entirely up to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) whether he wishes to give way to the hon. members for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) and Waterloo North (Mr. Brown).

MR. BLACKWELL: Possibly, Mr. Speaker, I might say something before the hon. members rise to speak. I might say, Mr. Speaker, my reluctance to rise in the first place was not a reluctance to advocate this bill, but merely a reluctance to rise and close the debate while any hon. member still wished to speak.

The delay in getting to my feet was to avoid doing something which perhaps I have unwittingly done in the past—to rise while you, Mr. Speaker, were still on your feet.

I do say this, Mr. Speaker—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Blackwell) is not closing the debate?

MR. BLACKWELL: Not at the moment. I have something further to say to hon. members making contributions to the debate.

I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact this is a debate on second reading, and I do not think hon. members should avail themselves of the opportunity of speaking twice in the debate, Mr. Speaker. Subject to that I will certainly defer closing the debate while some hon. members still wish to make contributions to the debate, on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: With that in mind, hon. members may carry on. I just wanted to try to maintain ordinary procedure. We will allow as much discussion as we possibly can.

MR. THORNBERRY: Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned here about the telegrams sent by the firefighter organizations of the various municipalities. I may say I received that same telegram, but on making inquiries from that particular association, I found they were concerned with their collective-bargaining rights and the other features in the bill of which they approved. They were not concerned with the fact of the standardization set out in the bill forcing the municipalities to live up to certain conditions or else forfeit the grant. That is the basis on which we are opposing it, and hoping that the bill might have more consideration between the department and the municipalities.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) in his arguments in favour of the bill pointed out certain things which I believe could very well be pointed out as being against it, as bearing equally as much weight against as for, as in the decrease in premiums. I do submit, Mr. Speaker, to hon. members that, with interference in the fire departments, it is quite possible we could lower the efficiency to such an extent that premiums would go up and not down. It is quite easy to visualize conditions existing where the efficiency of a fire department might be interfered with, and where a great fire would be attended by inexperienced men not fully qualified to handle it, causing heavier loss in property damage and thereby causing an increase in the rates. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park), the 94 different standards of hose in the province could very well be overcome without this particular measure, and could be looked after.

The fact the Firefighters' Association's concern was with their collective bargaining rights does not interfere with the principle of this bill, in as far as the municipalities were not consulted, and are concerned.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, having already spoken on this bill on another occasion, I submit to the rules of the House.

MR. C. C. CALDER (L London): Mr. Speaker, it appears to me the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) would do a service to the House and to the course of this debate if he would now be so kind as to confirm or amplify the statement which is attributed to him on the front page of this afternoon's *Toronto Star,* saying that he has in mind certain modifications for this Fire Department Bill. Were that to be done now, perhaps the debate would be shortened.

MR. SPEAKER: That would, I think, involve a question of procedure as to whether hon. members would be satisfied to adjourn the debate with the hon. Attorney-General's statement and have a more full discussion in committee, and then bring the bill back to the House with whatever recommendations you care to make. If it is the pleasure of the House that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) be allowed to amplify his statement, which

has appeared in the press, I am quite willing to allow it, but the whole question again resolves itself into whether we shall allow further debate on the statements which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) will now make, and then give him a third opportunity to reply.

That is the problem with which we are confronted.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I think the point of my friend, the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) is well taken. As this bill now stands, we are opposed to it, but it may be the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), giving voice to some of the predictions in the newspapers that there are changes going to be made, will be able to persuade even us that the bill in its new clothes is worthy of support. I would say the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), if he would, should clarify this picture at the moment. It only requires unanimous support of the House to have the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) speak yet again, if another debate arises as the result of his remarks.

It seems to me that would be the proper way to proceed, if it meets with the approval of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell).

MR. SPEAKER: I am prepared to accept that, provided the House will allow the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to speak again should it be decided to go into further debate.

However, I am now advised we cannot go into further debate—

MR. OLIVER: What is that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: —except with the unanimous consent.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): We can do anything we like with unanimous consent.

MR. SPEAKER: I am advised the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) may make a statement to clarify, but that will not be considered a final conclusion to the debate. If the House will accept that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if you will permit, I do not see how we can escape the necessity, under the rules, of voting on the principle of the bill on second reading. I have not the slightest objection if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) wants to indicate now what manner of amendments he has in mind for the committee stage. I am sure that would be welcome to the House. However, he cannot move the amendments at this stage, and before we get into committee we have to get through second reading. I do not see any escape from that position, and I would suggest, with all due respect to what has been said here, that sometime this afternoon we have to make up our minds whether to vote for or against the principle of the bill.

That is the question before the House at the present time.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I did not wish to intrude in the discussion the question of what would be in order or what might be out of order, but I might say I did come into the House this afternoon with this thought in mind, that although the appropriate place to move any amendments to sections is in committee, nevertheless it might very well affect the judgment of the individual members as to how they might vote on the bill if they had some indication of what the modifications I may propose were.

I feel in the course of what I have to say I should do that and then I presume, following that, the question would be, is any new material raised in relation to the principles of this bill which might justify further debates? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, through you to the hon. members of the House, that we might well leave that question until we get to that point.

If it meets with the approval of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. leaders of the other groups, I will proceed with what I have to say which would normally close the debate, but I am not putting that forward in any absolute terms.

If I may proceed on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would first like to say something about the progress of this bill through the House, because in his contribution—if I may term it that—to the debate, by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), he insinuated that if I had a request from a number of hotelkeepers to hold a bill over for a day or so, I would have been delighted to do that. This carried the inference that I was not prepared to hold the bill over for consideration where somebody else wished to make representations.

The first thing I would like to do is to clear the record in that regard.

May I remind the hon. members that the Police and Fire Departments Bills were introduced on March 4th. Second reading of the bills was deferred for the very considerable period elapsing between March 4th and Wednesday, March 16th, when they were called for second reading. The reason for that was, in the first place, the government thought the bills were important bills, and before any representations were made at all, they were permitted to stand on the order paper for an appropriate time, so that they could be examined by the hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, the next thing that happened was that the Mayors and Reeves Association expressed a desire—and I emphasize this—not to see the Cabinet as a whole, but to see the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy). The hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) communicated with me about this desire and indicated he would like me to be present. As the responsible Minister, I immediately acquiesced in that, and went farther, and suggested to the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) that under no circumstances should these bills be called for second reading, where the broad principle is considered, without meeting the deputation. May I again emphasize that the deputation was not a deputation which at that point wished to meet the Cabinet.

I shall try to be completely frank with the hon. members of the Legislature as to what that deputation was about, because there were two separate lines of representations made by that deputation, which the House should appreciate.

The first of these is that the Association of Mayors and Reeves was pressing for what might be described as the type of provincial-municipal conference which would ordinarily be utilized in a dominion-provincial conference. I would like to deal with that situation first, because there is no parallel between the circumstances which arise in relation to a dominion-provincial conference and those which arise in a provincial-municipal conference, for very obvious reasons.

The British North America Act, after all, is our constitution, if we want to put it that way. Under that constitution the dominion and the provinces have what some people refer to as "rights" in relation to fields of government. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that just to describe something as a "right" in relation to government is mis-descriptive, because if you have a constitutional right in a field of government, it carries with it a corresponding responsibility to deal within that field. In order to support the responsibilities which go with these respective "rights" or "responsibilities," as one may describe them, divided between the dominion and the provinces, there is equally a constitutional arrangement of tax bases; in other words, the province in relation to its responsibilities of government has a tax base, which is covered by the constitution. It does not matter what the dominion seeks to confer on the provinces by statute; it is there by the constitution; therefore, the dominion-provincial conference—and I do not want to bog this discussion down in the why's and whereas' of that conference—but it is this: That when you are settling tax affairs, you must, at the same time settle responsibilities, because whatever level of government takes the responsibility, it has a legal responsibility, and that level of government must also have the taxing sources which go with those responsibilities, which they cannot evade.

The situation between the provinces and the municipalities is entirely different. The responsibilities of the

municipalities of the Province of Ontario are found in the legislation of this province. They represent legislative acts of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and these represent the discharge by this government of some of those responsibilities. So, may I say that when a municipality talks to us about the sort of a committee that is to set up a panel of experts which is to advise the elected representatives in this Legislative Assembly on the one hand, and the municipal authorities in the municipal level of government on the other, as to what they are to do, it cannot be accepted by the government of the Province of Ontario, because that would not be accepting the responsibility of the Provincial Government in this province.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, I have said enough to indicate a distinction, and that is the background against which this discussion took place for some two and one-half hours the other day between myself and the representatives of the mayors and reeves of the Province of Ontario.

In that discussion I was quite frank in what I said. They only asked to come here about these two bills, but the fact of the matter is what they were really concerned with was a much broader question, and that was the decision on policy as brought down by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in his budget, that the one-mill subsidy which was granted to all municipalities in lieu of the income tax which was imposed by some of them, was unsound by reason of the wide variation in assessments and tax rates throughout the province, which led to some municipalities getting far more in relation to other municipalities than they should get. The obligation of the Government of the Province of Ontario was to see that some sounder system of grants to municipalities was developed. So the companion bills which were mentioned by the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in his budget speech represents—and this fact should be plainly before this Legislature, as it was plainly before the mayors and reeves—a policy by this government that grants made to municipalities should be on the basis of some over-all provincial policy, and that these grants should be used to secure the carrying out of that provincial policy, where the fields of provincial government and the municipal governments were integrated. That was made plain at that time.

The second series of questions which arose were in relation to the provisions of these particular bills, and at the conclusion of the conference I indicated to the mayors and reeves who were present that I would faithfully direct the mind of the government, as a whole, to the questions they had raised in the two-and-one-half hour discussion in relation to these bills. That, Mr. Speaker, I did.

That brings me to the question of the consideration of these representations I have received, and to the modifications in principle which will be proposed in committee, if these bills pass second reading, in relation to those representations.

I will give them now, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members of the House, not in the form of specfic amendments, but I will try and give to the hon. members of the Legislature an adequate indication of the nature of these proposed modifications.

First of all, these relate to a question —and this shows how useful debates can be—which was raised by the hon. member for one of the Windsor ridings (Mr. Ellis) in regard to the question of superannuation. He brought forward the indication that in that particular municipality the present bill, although it might be generally equitable and fair, failed to take into account there were special provisions by that municipality for contributing a larger percentage of the superannuation fund, and he was fearful that the bill might upset that arrangement in some way.

The first modification is to meet that, or any like situation, where the provisions will be sufficiently flexible, and where they will not interfere with the plans of contributions between the employers and employees, insofar as

they are within reason, and do not exceed the combined minimum of 10 per cent. from both, under the bill.

I believe, for the sake of comprehensiveness at this point, I should indicate to the Legislature there will be a modification in regard to the question of the payment of subsidies, where the municipalities defer part of their payments. It is proposed in committee to introduce an appropriate amendment whereby the municipalities will receive these subsidies in cash without reference to whether the payments are being deferred or not.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to the third of the modifications which will be proposed. I believe the section to which the greatest objection is directed is Section 14. I believe that is the number. In any event, it is the section, or combination of sections, which provide that the municipality, upon certification of expenditures, will get one-half of the subsidy, and following that, on inspection and certification by the Fire Marshal, they will get the balance, with the right of appeal to the Municipal Board.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, to eliminate those provisions in their entirety, so that the result will be the municipalities will get their subsidies on the certification of their expenditure, and the reason I feel I can propose that is simply this; there is a lot to be said—despite what I have said about the difference in the constitutional positions—that it is highly desirable in most of these cases that as far as possible the results should be achieved by education, by conferences, and by co-operation. I feel I can safely say that.

These bills are important. I emphasize that again. They are important from the point of view of national security, and as I stand here in the Legislature I am quite confident that throughout this province those who sit on our municipal councils are just as concerned with the attainment of these standards as we are here ourselves, and I am satisfied that over the course of the next year, by education, conference and co-operation, we will arrive at the agreed standards, and there will be a better co-operation on that basis than if we proceeded with that section today, in relation to the expressed alarm in relation to it. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members can take it that if they vote for the principle of this bill on second reading, these modifications will be put forward as I have mentioned, and they are subject to debate on these individual sections in committee.

I want to emphasize this point, Mr. Speaker, that the question of national security in these measures is not a new or sudden statement. This Legislature unanimously supported the collective bargaining provisions in the Fire Departments Act which was enacted in this Legislature in the session of 1947. Furthermore, when it was demonstrated after one year's administration that sanctions were necessary to make these collective-bargaining provisions work, in 1948 every hon. member in this Legislature voted to impose the necessary sanctions by withholding the municipal subsidies, to make these collective-bargaining provisions operative. Every hon. member of this Legislature who was in this place voted to interfere, to that degree, at that time, with what is called "municipal autonomy."

Consequently, when difficulties developed as between municipalities and fire departments, both in relation to collective-bargaining agreements and arbitration, the representatives of many municipalities came to my office, and I was frank with them at that time. I told those municipal representatives, as they came to my office, that one of the underlying objects of these provisions at that time was that in the event of a national emergency, it was necessary to have loyal, qualified, trained and equipped fire departments in this province. As a result of that sort of discussion, those who were minded to oppose these provisions, decided it was the sound thing to do to accept them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the same time I felt in fairness to the municipalities of this province that the provincial administration had gone a long way in

imposing obligations upon the municipal level of government, particularly in regard to the question of money, without some corresponding assistance being forthcoming to make it easier for them to co-operate in really having an overall provincial policy. So when the briefs were presented last October, and when they had, as a provision of that brief, an objection to the collective-bargaining provision, and desired to get rid of it, I was aware that in this Legislature not a single hon. member would vote to remove the collective-bargaining provisions which were there for the advantage of those who worked on fire departments. I felt an obligation, accordingly, from a departmental point of view, to provide some provincial assistance to make this provision less onerous, and to provide further assistance to enable fire departments to reach the standard that the national security situation seemed to require.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I regret that when this bill was under debate here before, I had to persistently question the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe)—and I say "persistently"—to try and get him make a clear statement as to whether he favoured giving effect to the municipal representations to get rid of collective-bargainings, and I wish he had said so right away. Instead of that, he worked himself into a sort of a synthetic frenzy, in which he brought in the question of the police and the question of the civil servants in the Province of Ontario.

May I suggest to him that this relates now to fire departments. Presently we will have the Police Bill before the Legislature, and if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) wants to argue with me at that point that there is not genuine collective-bargaining on the part of the police forces of this province, I will deal with that at that time. Later on he can argue with the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Porter) about the type of civil service provisions we have in this province. The fact of the matter is I do not think there is a single hon. member of this Legislature who would go on record as voting against the principle of collective-bargaining, as contained in these bills.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Your questions were answered.

MR. BLACKWELL: With great hesitation.

MR. JOLLIFFE: With no hesitation whatsoever, and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) knows it.

MR. BLACKWELL: He got up after some considerable time—

MR. JOLLIFFE: With no hesitation whatsoever. I make my speeches in my own way, and at my own time, and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is only drawing on his fevered imagination when he says I hesitated.

MR. BLACKWELL: The statement was very much delayed, and when it came it was the result of a great deal of feverish work in the meantime.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was good enough at that time to read a letter from the Association of Mayors and Reeves, and the hon. member who followed said we did not represent the fire departments, or anybody else—

MR. JOLLIFFE: He said no such a thing.

MR. BLACKWELL: Of course he did.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member did not make that statement.

MR. BLACKWELL: We will look it up in *Hansard*.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We certainly will.

MR. BLACKWELL: But, in any event, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) felt last Wednesday, that by reading a letter, he was making himself an advocate of the cause of the mayors and reeves.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do you object to my reading the letter?

MR. BLACKWELL: No; read anything you like. You certainly will not object then, to the letter which I will read in a moment.

I might say, in view of the fact, that the reading of letters and communications has become the fashion, I would like to read one or two letters which I had received which are typical. This is a letter signed by the secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress—that was the deputation to which the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) referred as being here just a few days ago.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): The Ontario Federation of Labour.

MR. BLACKWELL: I will read this:

> "Ontario Provincial Federation of Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, representing more than 200,000 workers in Ontario, endorses Fire Departments Act, 1949. See page 18 memorandum presented to Premier and Cabinet, March 14, 1949. Federation believes that fire fighters should have protection given by Act."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, they do not refer to infringement of municipal rights.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): They will all be voting for us.

MR. BLACKWELL: The next is a telegram from R. Swanborough, Secretary, Provincial Federation of Ontario Fire Fighters:

> "Our Federation in complete accord with principles of proposed amendment to Fire Departments Act now before House."

This one (indicating) is of particular interest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). It is a copy of a letter sent to him by the York Township Fire Fighters Association, to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in his capacity as hon. member for York South, and to the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard). It reads as follows:

> "There has been considerable publicity given through the press to the bill regarding the Fire Departments Act, 1949, which is before the Legislature at the present time.
>
> We, the members of York Township Fire Fighters Association, Local 411, I.A.F.F., A.F. of L., wish to inform you, as our representative in the Provincial Legislature that, we heartily endorse this bill, which also has the approval of our parent body the Provincial Federation of Ontario Fire Fighters.
>
> We feel that, with the adoption of the bill progress will be made and, the general public in the not too distant future will realize this fact, particularly so, should an emergency arise, the true value of the bill will be brought to light.
>
> We therefore request that you as our representative support the bill through its final stages."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Read what McCallum said.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He is your mayor.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I will close with this: The broad government policy in its provincial grants as covered by the budget speech of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and with the modifications I have suggested, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this bill, I say to the Legislature, they are the policies of the Government of Ontario, and they are supported by the supporters of the government here in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. E. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

The elimination of Sections 14 and

15 of the proposed Act, means that this grant resolves itself into a basis of giving a grant. It has nothing to do with the giving of a grant to the Fire Department. In other words, the municipality will get 15 per cent. of its costs but it does not offer to pay that to the Fire Department.

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh, no, they have to apply it to the Fire Department.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Fire Marshall's sections, Sections 14 and 15, has that been removed? Did I understand you to say these restrictions will not exist in the amended bill?

MR. BLACKWELL: That is what I indicated, but the grants must be expended on the Fire Department. Let us have no doubt about that.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, is there any expectancy on the part of the government that where the Fire Departments are brought up to higher standards, someting will be done by Ontario fire insurance companies to lower their rates in these areas? The low standards at the present time is the excuse which has been given in some cases for charging higher rates. Are the people who are paying fire insurance premiums going to get any benefit out of the grants, which they are paying out of the public purse, for improved standards for fire protection?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I do not know whether all hon. members of the Legislature know this, but for those who do not know it, I will explain. The underwriters carry out a most detailed inspection in different municipalities in which they estimate, for the benefit of the municipalities, of the major fire hazards with which they have to compete. They make recommendations which have not the force of law but which, if carried into effect, are followed by corresponding reductions in fire premiums.

I believe some hon. member suggested it would make the premiums higher. As a matter of fact, the more efficiency there is in Fire Departments, the more satisfied the underwriters will be to consider the lowering of premiums.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was just going to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) this question. Do I understand that the outline he has given this afternoon and changes he proposed, are all-inclusive? I mean, they represent the only changes he has in mind at the present time to be made in committee. Am I correct in that understanding?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I think I was quite clear in what I said. I hope every hon. member, when the bill is in committee stage, will make any suggestions they see fit. At that time it will be open to any hon. member of the House to suggest any modification he might wish.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is all I want to get clear, that those are the two the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has in mind?

MR. BLACKWELL: Three.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Three. Perhaps I misunderstood. I think he said something with respect to pensions and he was going to remove some of the requirements of Section 14.

MR. BLACKWELL: And I also mentioned the other question that was raised about the province's subsidy payment in relation to municipalities buying equipment.

I indicated that would be in too.

MR. W. A. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) if he has any information from the City of Toronto, as to whether or not the mayor of Toronto will accept these changes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TEMPLE: I am influenced by the mayor of Toronto and the Toronto

City Council and I think he might consult with the mayor and find out how he feels about the modifications.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): I did not think you were influenced by anybody.

MR. TEMPLE: Not by Conservatives.

MR. BLACKWELL: I, too, represent one of the Toronto constituencies in the Legislature, namely, Eglinton. However, I think the modifications I have suggested will give satisfaction as far as I know, and we certainly gave plenty of time to consider the main one, but they were worried mainly about the fundamental over all policy. I do not think this government could do anything to please Mayor McCallum and the Toronto Board of Control, who are looking forward to the next mayor's contest. We could not make them completely happy.

MR. BROWN: Just to further enlighten us on the question I asked a while ago. Assuming we have a very efficient Fire Department in, say, the City of Kitchener, and assuming we have not found it necessary to increase the cost of the department, we can still get 50 per cent. of our costs and apply it?

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh, sure, that is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, following up the question I asked the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), I think he might be interested to hear from me, although, like himself, I have already spoken in this debate. As I said, we welcomed the outline he has given this afternoon of the changes he has in mind and while we are not withdrawing the objections we made the other day to the bill or to the manner in which the bill is being piloted through the House by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), nevertheless, we do—

MR. FROST: Are you going to vote with us?

MR. JOLLIFFE: —commend the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) for exhibiting a flexibility here today which was unknown in former years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He should be commended for showing he is prepared to travel some distance towards meeting the objections raised last week. Subject to our right to consider the amendments in committee, and, subject, of course, to discussions later and our right to vote against this bill when we have seen all the amendments, as far as we are concerned we no longer object to this bill going to committee. This, of course, it cannot do unless it goes through second reading. I know the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) will not be sorry to hear that, and we really must commend him for the flexibility he has shown today which was heretofore unknown.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak because I realize I cannot do that, having already spoken, but following what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said, I would like to commend this to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) today.

It is an old saying: "If I realize that I know little, I will try to learn more."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Are you going to vote with us?

MR. SPEAKER: If there are no more questions I think, if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) wishes to conclude the debate, it is now his privilege to do so.

MR. BLACKWELL: We want a division.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do suggest, in all deference to you and to the government that it is very unfair to call for a recorded vote before the members of this Legislature have had an opportunity to see the amendments the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is proposing.

I think he should be prepared to accept concurrence without a recorded vote.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We can force divisions, too, and we will force plenty if that is the way you want it.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): How can you get a recorded vote when there are no "nays"?

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, just like a bunch of school children.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Well, our schools are pretty good.

Motion agreed to unanimously on division.

AYES: 75
NAYS: Nil

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 68.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 68th Order, second reading of Bill No. 132, "The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949." Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 132, "The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make one or two comments on this bill. On first reading, I outlined generally its provisions, but I think perhaps to some extent I might review that. There are also one or two other points I would like to make in connection with it.

This bill, as I think hon. members will agree, provides a "new deal" in superannuation for teachers. The sweeping changes will mean that within 10 years' time teachers will be retiring at pensions which on the average will be twice as much as they are today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: The whole scheme of payments under this new bill will be guaranteed by the government and will not depend upon the solvency of any fund. Not only will the percentage of salary paid as pension be increased from 60 per cent. to 70 per cent., but the average salary upon which it is based will be higher. 70 per cent. of the average salary in the 15 years preceding retirement will be paid as pension. Under the old Act, the percentage was based on the whole contributary period, which includes earlier years of service when, of course, the average salary was low. Also during the last 4 years, the average of teachers' salaries throughout the province has steadily risen. The full effect of this will show in the steady increase in pensions during the next 10 years.

This bill makes special provisions for teachers who are now on pension, some of whom are now receiving, under the old scheme, in the neighbourhood of $300 or $400 a year, or even less. All of these will receive at least $600 under the new bill, and all present pensioners will receive an increase of at least $120.

At this point, I would like to say when this bill reaches committee I intend to propose an amendment which is the result of a certain matter which has been drawn to my attention in connection with some of the teachers who are now on superannuation. I will propose an amendment, which will, to all intents and purposes, abolish some of the ceilings which exist under the old Act for some of the teachers who are now on superannuation who have paid into the fund more than other teachers who are receiving the same pension, and it is considered that it would be fair that they should be entitled to the full benefit of what they have paid in under the old Act. It will make comparatively little difference over all. There are a few cases which will be affected, and I propose to introduce that new amendment in committee.

Teachers' contributions will be increased from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. Should demands in any year exceed contributions to the fund, the government

will make up the difference. This is not likely to happen within the next 30 years, and in the meantime it is estimated the present superannuation fund of $50,000,000 will steadily grow until in 30 years it will reach a figure of more than $140,000,000.

The government is, in effect, guaranteeing pensions on the scale and at the rate provided in this bill. This is an entirely new departure because under the old Act, the payment of pensions depended entirely upon the condition of the fund.

Should contributions exceed payments, the surplus will be added to the fund, and interest will be paid at 4½ per cent. per annum, as in the past. Provision is also made for dependents of pensioners under certain conditions. They will receive pensions at half the rates of those paid to pensioners.

Provision is also made for partial pensions to teachers who have taught for a total of 25 years. Under the old Act, that applied only to teachers who had taught a total of 30 years, so it is being extended to that extent.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Mr. Speaker, I, as well as every hon. member of the Legislature, want a satisfactory superannuation for teachers, and for all of them. I think the bill does present certain weaknesses. I personally do not feel that it is generous to certain groups, and I feel it is over generous to others.

I am very happy to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) say that—at least I took it from what he said—he is going to do better for teachers who are now retired than the bill would lead one to suppose. Am I right in thinking that?

MR. PORTER: Yes. I may say to the hon. member (Miss Macphail) that the increases I have indicated on second reading will still apply, but there are some new cases where teachers were limited under the old bill to a certain ceiling pension. As the hon. member (Miss Macphail) no doubt knows, where a teacher contributed to the fund over a long period of years, and if this contribution earned, say a pension of $1,000, then they went on contributing and all they got was $1,000. What I propose to submit as an amendment will be that they will be entitled to the full earned pension, plus the additions which are provided in this bill. It will affect a few cases, but I think it is the only fair thing to do in view of the fact that it has been brought to my attention that such people had been overlooked.

MISS MACPHAIL: Certainly the explanation makes one think—

MR. PORTER: They will all get the $120 more in addition to that.

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes. It is the only just thing to do, but I feel teachers who have been retired in the last 10 years or so are the ones who are suffering most, because they taught in an age when teachers' salaries were low; they probably taught through part or all of the depression of the 30's, and now their pension is low and they are using that pension in an inflationary period in which the dollar they paid in, bought far more, and they are using it in a period in which it does not buy anywhere near as much as it did in the days it was paid in, so it seems to me they are really getting the short end of things.

I think they should be treated better even than they are going to be, with the improvement which the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has told us about. I have heard all sorts of things from a great many teachers, both retired and people in favour of the bill and people against the bill. There has been a very heavy lobby in favour of the bill, but there are also many teachers, some of whom are retired and some women teachers who are yet teaching, who are not very enthusiastic about the bill. I am looking at it only from a point of view of justice to all groups, and I feel the retired teachers are really getting a bad break. It is not anybody's fault particularly, but the dollars they have paid in at the time they paid them in would buy much more in the way of housing, clothes and food than they will now, and they are getting very small pensions indeed.

I feel $10 a month in really nothing.

We all know that, so let us not fool ourselves. A $10 a month increase is a little better than not getting it, but that is about all you can say. It is certainly not much of an increase and has no relation at all to the upper brackets, shall I say, of $1,500, which are going to be increased to $3,000.

It does not sound well to me that teachers who have spent a lifetime teaching, who taught through a period of low salaries and depression conditions are now to get an increase of $10 a month, while the top bracket people in the teaching profession are now to be superannuated, and from now on, if they are at the very top, at $3,000 a year, which is a very comfortable superannuation.

MR. T. H. ISLEY (CCF Waterloo South): Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: I am not impressed with that. I thought we would get a more generous bill providing for a highly educated group of people, a group which is teaching, or which we believe is teaching, good citizenship to their students during a lifetime. It does not look like a very generous or even just action on their part.

I think there is too great a spread. The people who were getting $500 superannuation—and there are a number of classes under that heading—are now getting superannuation of $600. They will be just rolling in wealth on that additional $100.

MR. PORTER: Surely the hon. member (Miss MacPhail) does not say anybody is going to be "rolling in wealth" as a result of this bill.

MISS MACPHAIL: No, that was irony.

MR. PORTER: Surely—

MISS MACPHAIL: Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) not—

MR. PORTER: Yes, but it is going on the record, you know. We do not get the irony in print.

MISS MACPHAIL: No, that is just the point. I do not think they are going to be rolling in wealth—

MR. PORTER: No.

MISS MACPHAIL: I think after hearing the balance of my speech, they will know what I mean. A $100 increase in the lower brackets, and doubling on the higher, seems to me unjustifiable. If they are only going to get $100 more in the lower bracket, it certainly is not worth getting very enthusiastic about, and I do not think it is worthy of an educated group of people to be putting it that way.

I am very disappointed. I have never been concerned about top-bracket people. They are always looking after themselves pretty well.

MR. PORTER: May I ask the hon. member (Miss Macphail) a question?

MISS MACPHAIL: If it is a question, but if it is a speech, make it some other time.

MR. PORTER: Oh, I never make speeches.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can say that again.

MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member (Miss Macphail) appreciate that there are over 1,000 teachers who are getting less than $600 now? Almost more than one-third of the teachers are getting less than $600 now. They will be benefited very, very much indeed. Surely the hon. member (Miss Macphail) recognizes that.

MISS MACPHAIL: Nobody should be getting less than $600 for teaching school these days.

MR. PORTER: They will not from now on.

MISS MACPHAIL: They should never have been.

MR. PORTER: I know, but they were.

MISS MACPHAIL: $600 is not a salary anybody could call a large one today. $600 is a very small sum of money.

MR. C. H. MILLARD: (CCF York West): Just relief.

AN HON. MEMBER: $50 a month.

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes, as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) says, it is a relief standard.

MR. PORTER: Yet the hon. member (Miss Macphail) said they would be "rolling in wealth" a minute ago.

MISS MACPHAIL: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is just being smart, and he does not make a very good job of it either.

MR. PORTER: I think the hon. member (Miss Macphail) was too.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is "up a tree."

MISS MACPHAIL: I thought the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) would recognize irony, but apparently he does not, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing I can do about it. He just does not recognize it.

I think teachers, of all people, should have been careful to raise the lower groups, even if they took it from the top groups. I think they could take a lesson from people who have had less education, on that point.

The thing I had intended to say before the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) interrupted me, is that I have never been concerned about the top-bracket people in any profession or business. They are quite capable of looking after themselves. You see right here they are putting on a very big lobby. I had a long experience in Ottawa with strong lobbies, and I have never encountered—I think that is the right word for lobbies—a strong lobby which was not setting out to advance some selfish interest, for some entrenched privileged group. I did not expect the teachers to use it. Again, I am very disappointed that they have done so.

I have been called out of bed by this lobby—

AN HON. MEMBER: Dear, dear.

MISS MACPHAIL: I do not enjoy it. I have been called from the Chamber, and so have you, I suppose; I have received a great many telegrams and a great many letters.

I find in every case these are coming from the people who are going to benefit most, which makes me read the bill with great care and be very dubious about it, and so I am going to vote for it, but I think it could have been much better. I think it is unworthy really of the group who drew it up. That is exactly what I think of it. Everybody sitting in this group may not agree with me but that is what I think of it.

I am disappointed in the lobby—

MR. PORTER: I am sure the hon. member (Miss Macphail) does not suggest we are responsible for the lobby.

MISS MACPHAIL: No, I do not. I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Porter) would not have understood it. I know the government would not be responsible for the lobby—everybody would have known that without me saying it. I think it is rather too bad that the teachers have put on a very strong lobby and they are putting up arguments.

The thing is that 70 per cent. of the teachers of the province are women teachers. Many of them do not marry, and teaching has been their life's work. They pay all through their teaching lifetime into superannuation. I think there is a weakness in the bill. To help the men teachers who extend half of their superannuation to their wives. I am quite willing that the wives should receive half the superannuation. I have no objection to that, but I do think where women have dependents—and there are many hundreds of cases of that sort—they have as much right to pay one-half of the superannuation to the parents they have been supporting, as the men have to pass on to their wives. I cannot see any difference. Women teachers have been paying in money for years. It would not happen in many cases where the mother died before the teacher, but in some cases it would happen. I think you have to be very careful about dependents. I realize the difficulty. You cannot pay all dependents with one-half the superannuation. It is too loose a term, but apparently there is no difficulty about defining

"parent." I am sure all of us know a great many teachers who are supporting parents. Women's life expectancy is higher than men's, but supposing the teacher does die before the mother, there is no provision for that contingency. If teachers have dependents to support, it means she has no capital of her own. She is a charity case, even though the teacher has taught for years and years and paid in to the superannuation fund. Why should she be? Because since 70 per cent. of the school teachers in Ontario are woman, and since they help the men provide for their wives by one-half of the superannuation they receive, I can see no reason why women teachers who have a parent whom they support entirely and dies before the parent, that the parent should not go in the same category although receiving one-half of the superannuation—

MR. PORTER: I have introduced into the bill the provision—carried over from the last Act—whereby a personal representative of a teacher dying can get back the amount of money actually paid in by the teacher, with interest. That is the same provision.

MISS MACPHAIL: After all, why should it not be the same provision? I do not believe in this profession, where they are predominantly women, that the men should be treated better than the women. There are far more teachers who are supporting their mothers, a great many more, and I think provision should be made for them other than getting back what they have already paid in, because that is not the same thing that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) knows—at least, I expect he knows.

MR. PORTER: Yes, I know.

MISS MACPHAIL: Well, that is good. I am so glad.

It is curious that the whole teaching profession—this is not addressed to the government, but rather to the Federation of Teachers—it is a wonder that some provision was not made that the men—who always seem to get better salaries than women—for some strange reason we do not pay for the work they do—why they do not see the men pay more into the pension fund since they are going to get more out of it, but they do not.

That is their problem, and not the government's, and not mine, but I do feel that we ought to do something for the women teachers. That ought to be done in the bill. Surely we can make slight changes. I cannot vote against the bill, because I do want to see the teachers have a better superannuation than the one they have now. That rather puts me on the "spot" on a vote, but I do not like the bill. So many places in it that I do not like, and again I say—I am saying this to the teachers. I want to be very clear and speak in words of one syllable—I am not speaking to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), I am speaking to the teachers and not to the government, I think it was very unfortunate that the lobby is so persistent and so heavy. The bill is before us—we represent people who are not teachers. For instance, in York East we have 80,000 electors, not 80,000 teachers, and we must do in this Legislature what we think is the best thing to do when we have studied the bill, when we come to vote on it, and so I am going to vote for the bill, but not because I like it. There are many things in it I do not like, but it is better than what they have had. I think it shows that the men teachers have been selfish, which I think is not in the least a rare thing, but in spite of all that, I am going to vote for the bill because it does move in the right direction, though unevenly and in some cases unfairly.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to say very much in connection with this bill. I do feel the bill pretty well speaks for itself. I feel it goes a long way to solve the needs of the problems both of the retired teachers and also the teachers who are still active. The only way I have had an opportunity of appraising this bill as it relates to the teachers, is through the telegrams and letters I have received from those in my constituency. I immediately sensed the deluge of telegrams as being lobbying, to a certain degree, and therefore did not pay too much attention to them,

but I did receive several letters from teachers—and nearly all of them from retired teachers—teachers who had taught in collegiates who had taught in public schools in urban municipalities, and who had also taught in rural municipalities—and I did not receive one single objection from any teacher who is now retired. I am, therefore, using that as a basis for me to determine what action I would take in connection with this bill, and I shall be very glad indeed to support it.

MR. W. E. HAMILTON (PC Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support this legislation, and I would like to answer a question. The actuarial societies have gathered down through the years statistics and they only include the life-expectancy of married females and to my knowledge there are no such statistics as yet compiled which would deal with the mothers of single ladies or mothers of married ladies who are dependents. Some day there may be those statistics gathered. It would be quite a study if as and when they are gathered and a computation could be made as to the amount which would be necessary to include such a provision. At the moment I would certainly say that no such statistics are available in order to make a computation.

MISS MACPHAIL: I want to ask a question. These women have taught. If the money the teachers cannot pay in that they have stated they are going to do, in the bill, it is underwritten by the Province of Ontario.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, a word about the lobbying. I, for one, do not object to being lobbied by teacher groups or any other group, and I might say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter)—

MR. PORTER: You take it as a compliment, do you?

MR. SALSBERG: I might say to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) who attempted to assure the House that he is not responsible for the lobby, that I think he is indirectly responsible. When he was the Minister of Planning and Development he sent out advices to the people of Ontario. I cherished those documents and I have quoted from them many a time. In those documents and at that time the then Minister of Planning and Development—who is now Minister of Education (Mr. Porter)—urged the people to lobby their members, make demands upon them, organize and approach them —and if they failed to act, he further advised the citizens to elect someone else. Now then, the teachers are taking your advice, and I think they are quite correct.

A word about the bill. The bill does bring about improvements for certain sections of teachers, but I do submit that the bill does not do enough for superannuated teachers, pensioned teachers. It is a neglected group, and the most suffering of all of the groups in the profession. I think that there is a way of solving their problem, even though the funds were established at a period when they were advanced in age, and therefore there is not an adequate reserve as far as they are concerned. It can be solved by this government throwing in the necessary amount of money to provide the superannuated teachers with an allowance or pension that will be enough to support them in decency for the rest of their days. I think that the province owes it to that category of the teaching profession. There are several members in this House who still have their teachers around, and, in every case, they are old or retired teachers, and I do not think any member of this Legislature would like to think that his teacher—who are now in the superannuated category—is denied the minimum needs of life by this government and by the people of this province.

I suggest that the people of this province would gladly support the government in an action which would provide that category of teachers with the minimum they need.

I know teachers—my own teachers—who are around, and I hope they will be around for many, many years, and I

have been told by at least one of them that his pension is not sufficient to support him. I saw one of my teachers in the gallery early this afternoon. He has left since, I know, because he was rushed to give a private lesson in order to augment his meagre income. I do not think he should be obliged to do that. I do not think any of us want that. I do not think it would cost an awful lot of money.

So far as the statement by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) that he has not received any complaints; I would like, for his information, and the information of the other hon. members of the House, to read into the record a news item which appeared in the *Toronto Daily Star,* on the 17th of this month. The heading of the item is as follows:

"Pensioned Teachers Protest Increase of $10 a Month."

The beginning of the news item, is as follows:

"The executive committee of the Ontario Superannuated Teachers yesterday voted unanimously 'complete dissatisfaction' with a $10 monthly increase in their pensions, contained in a new Superannuation Act, introduced by the Ontario Government. They renewed their demands for a $500 annual increase, and other changes. The executive named a delegation to meet the Cabinet to press for these amendments."

Then the news item contains statements made by William F. Kirk, and others, on this question.

I do not want to belabour the point, Mr. Speaker, that item is not a very large one, not sufficient to justify the government hesitating on it. They are dealing with a matter that is close to the hearts of all people, and I think they should agree to amending that part of the bill which will take care of the superannuated teachers, in particular.

Just one word to the teachers, if I may, Mr. Speaker, through this chamber. It is sad to see the lack of unity amongst the teachers. I wish they were more united, and I wish they would strive for more agreement amongst themselves, before approaching legislative bodies on matters concerning them. They do themselves no good. It is surprising to see the men teachers expressing dissatisfaction with the bill, without paying sufficient attention to their colleagues of yesterday, the superannuated teachers. It is not a very happy experience to find the women teachers separating themselves from another group, and sending letters to the hon. members of the Legislature. I wish they were united, and I wish they would organize into a trade union of teachers. They would then learn how to act in unison in their best interests.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, with an appeal to the government to reconsider especially the problem of the superannuated teachers, and increase the superannuation, at the cost to the government, of an amount which would take care of their minimum needs.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I understood the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to say that under this bill the contributions from the teachers had been raised from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) if there has been any change in the government's financial participation in its payments toward the superannuation fund.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, the government's annual contribution remains at 4 per cent. but the government will underwrite the fund. The government will take full responsibility—financial responsibility—for all claims for pensions under this bill, when they arise. That is entirely a new departure from the old Act, because under the old Act a pension depended entirely upon the condition of the fund. If the fund was insolvent, the amount of the pension would have to be paid *pro rata.*

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is no real risk.

MR. PORTER: None whatever. If this government remains in power until 1990, we will be all right.

MR. OLIVER: Perish the thought.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, I am in somewhat the same position as the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail). I think the government is to be commended at the distance to which they have gone to protect our teachers by this bill. But in speaking to this House on another occasion, I felt I had drawn to the attention of every hon. member that we do have difficulty in another regard, and that is by way of inducement to people best qualified to go into the teaching profession. I believe this bill does go some distance in providing a greater measure of security, and, therefore, serves as some inducement for teachers to go into the teaching profession, in order that they will realize that they will be taken care of to a certain degree at a future date, if they are able to qualify under the present Act, or any future Acts which might be brought in, regarding superannuation.

But there are several things in regard to the bill which I feel leaves a great deal to be desired, and some of them are matters of principle, rather than the amounts of the actual money involved.

First of all, the bill is based on the ability of the teachers to pay into the fund, and, therefore, it is largely determined by how much they will draw out. In looking over the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) report for 1947, a copy of which I have in front of me, I find there are approximately as many teachers employed in Ontario in the rural sections as there are in the cities. That means that while they do not have the same number of pupils, in fact, their salaries are going to be considerably below the salaries paid in the cities, and there is not opportunity, no matter how good teachers they may be, if they are going to stay in the profession, for these teachers getting into the areas where the higher salaries are paid. Therefore, no opportunity for them to build up for themselves a degree of security such as can be done in the cities and towns, where the higher salaries are paid. The towns will probably simply be of an in between system.

I say where the bill provides that where the salary is less than $1,000, for the purpose of contributions it will be deemed to be $1,000. It seems to me, again referring to the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) report as he pointed out previously in the Legislature, there are practically no teachers, if any, in that category, unless it would be the teachers of Orders in the Separate Schools, where the salaries are less than $1,000. So that provision does not mean much. It is just so many words added to the bill.

I would like to see them put in something like realistic salaries for this particular profession, because there is a point where you could make contributions, not only on behalf of the teachers, but the governmental contributions themselves, from the revenues of the province, which would be consistent with providing the principal teachers with greater superannuation income, and, therefore, more inducement to stay in the country where they are trained and equipped to serve, and will provide some degree of equity in the question of superannuation.

There is another point which I think is quite important, so far as principle is concerned, and that is in the commission which is going to administer the fund. I know some of them are to be appointed, and some are to be elected from those who are contributing, but there is this other group at the present time, numbering approximately 2,412, who are on superannuation, and it seems to me they should also be directly represented, and if I have any fault to find with the bill itself it is that it does not protect this particular group nearly enough.

There is some improvement. $10 per month, or $120 per year, with a minimum of $600. It seems to me, and there again I agree with the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail), that when you look over the present list you will find there are 1,767 teachers in Ontario now on superannuation, receiving less than $1,000 per year. I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) and the other hon. members of the government, how do you expect to provide a decent inducement to teachers to go into the profession and serve a lifetime—

because I presume most of these people on superannuation have served pretty much a lifetime in the profession, and have qualified for their superannuation payments—but how do you expect these people are going to be induced to go into the profession when you have at the present time, as an example, some 1,700 people who are getting less than $1,000 a year.

MR. FROST: That is being changed for the future.

MR. MILLARD: But it will take some considerable time.

MR. FROST: No, it becomes effective on April 1st.

MR. MILLARD: And these people will get up to the minimum of $600, and in addition the $120—

MR. FROST: They may get a pension up to $2,300 or $2,400.

MR. MILLARD: With the adjustment, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) speaks of, there may be some increases. I would like to point out the very large percentage—in fact, there are only 645 who are paid $1,000 a year, and only 87 who are getting $1,400 and $1,500 at the present time. So the number who are going to get above the $1,500, by reason of some accumulated credits they have not taken advantage of before, is relatively small.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is another point which I see in the bill which I regret, and that is, there is no provision made for these people to go into teaching for five years or under, who then quit the profession, and they have to pay in while they are teaching, but so far as the bill goes, they can take nothing out, according to the provisions of the bill.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: They leave their amounts there to stay in the fund.

MR. PORTER: If they return they get credit for what they have paid in. That is the way it has always been.

MR. MILLARD: That is not at all fair. They ought to be able to take out what they put in, even if they do not take out the government's contribution.

MR. PORTER: How would you build up a fund?

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): Put a surrender value when they leave.

MR. MILLARD: I would suggest to the government there are no cases I know of in pension plans anywhere where deductions are made—and these are deductions made, because they have no option but to pay in the 6 per cent. They are deducted at the source. It is a check-off. They are deducted from the grants which will go to these various schools. The board will receive the grants less the amount of the pension contributions from that board, or from that school.

I say these people ought to at least, when the money has been deducted from their pay, withdraw it when they leave, because they are not going to get any benefit out of the fund. They at least should be able to draw back, possibly without interest, the principal which they have invested.

Again there are many people who start in the teaching profession and who, for one reason or another, do not go through with it. They change their minds, or they get married or something else. In any event, they leave the profession—

MR. PORTER: They can always wait for six years.

MR. MILLARD: Again I come back to my question, how are you going to induce these people to enter the profession when you are placing this handicap upon them immediately, that 6 per cent. of their salary is going to be deducted, and if they only stay for four years and nine months, or the four teaching terms, then they are likely to lose all their investment in this superannuation fund. That seems to be a matter of principle, which certainly ought to be corrected before it comes to committee.

I have nothing more to say, Mr.

Speaker, except I want to again issue my protest on the failure to provide for those who are presently on superannuation. They are not getting adequate increases. You cannot except these people who have put in sometimes a lifetime in service in the teaching profession, with small pay and small incomes, to live on this miserable superannuation income, which does not permit them to live but meagerly, and serves as a poor example for those who might be induced to go into the profession from here on out.

I want to protest most vigorously regarding this particular group. I say the principle is wrong, when you are only increasing the minimum 20 per cent., but increasing the maximum 100 per cent. I have no objection to the maximum, because these people who are going to get the maximum will pay in larger amounts. I think that is a sound principle. But I think that some way must be found to care for these people who have given their lives in the service, and who have built up the present fund.

Now, what about the present fund? The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) stands in his place today and tells us the government is prepared to make up the deficits, the amounts of the payments out over revenue, from 6 per cent. and 4 per cent. If the payments should be larger, the government will pay the difference. Then the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) says this is not likely to occur, at least for the next 30 years. That is just so much window dressing; it does not mean anything.

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes, it does.

MR. MILLARD: It does not mean any more than the $1,000, outside of the Teaching Orders, which I have mentioned. That means that the present fund is adequate, and it seems to me it should help to take care of those people who helped to build up the fund.

MR. PORTER: The present fund is not yet quite on actuarial basis.

MR. MILLARD: It was admitted that for the next 30 years there would be no difficulty in making up the deficits. Then the fund is sound. If they expect it will stand for 30 years, with these new demands, and the new payments—

MR. FROST: Not at all.

MR. MILLARD: It seems to me the number involved, namely, 1,767 people of this province who are getting less, probably will be getting less when you pay even the extra $120 a year. It seems to me, the government could have provided for this group of people if for no other reason—if not on a humanitarian basis, then to point out to the people in this day and generation that there is no danger as to the future of the teachers, these people who make this kind of social contribution will be secured, no matter what government is in power in this province, but they will be taken care of in the future, if the fund breaks down.

If the teachers are not going to be concerned with this question of superannuation, they may very well find themselves in a similar position, when it becomes time for them to superannuate, and they will expect better treatment at that time. All I am asking is this government provide for those who are now superannuated, and who have made their contributions. Let us take care of them more adequately, than this bill provides.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) just made a statement a moment ago which does not jibe with the statement he made when he introduced the bill. He said that the $50,000,000 would grow until it reached $140,000,000.

MR. PORTER: Approximately. That is an estimate.

MR. DENNISON: A moment ago he said the present fund was not actuarily sound.

MR. PORTER: No, I said they were not quite sure. Because there is an actuarial examination going on now. There has been one every three years. As a matter of fact, there has always been a deficit as shown by the actuaries up to the present, but with the $50,000,-

000, we reach actuarial solvency. I do not think it makes any difference.

MR. DENNISON: Yes, that brings up the question of what the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is asking us to approve, without giving us the facts. If a municipality is setting up a pension fund, and they go to the Municipal Board, and then the board asks that they have a statement from the experts to the effect that the fund will be solvent, and that the payments in the future will be sufficient to maintain the fund, and that the local municipality, at some future date, will not find itself forced to pay large amounts to rescue the fund.

MR. FROST: That is the guarantee we have.

MR. DENNISON: Now, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) presents us with a bill that does not have attached to it any statement from an actuary, in regard to the fund. There is no statement before this House that this fund will be solvent from the standpoint of the fund itself.

MR. PORTER: We do not claim it will be. We say we are guaranteeing any deficit which may arise, which is much better.

MR. DENNISON: I would rather have the experts statement on that, than your statement, because I do not think it is setting up a financially sound fund at all. I submit it is not a business-like proposal to present a bill to this House without such a statement.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I think there is no doubt that for the teachers in Ontario who will be superannuated in future years, this bill represents a very great improvement over conditions of the past, and on that ground, may I say I am sure we welcome the bill, and will be very happy indeed to find our teachers retiring in the future on a more secure footing than they ever have been able to before.

At the same time, there are many of us who regret that a lot of the teachers who have already retired will be in no way benefited in the future. It occurs to me that this is another example of the hardship which has been imposed upon large numbers of older people in this country, because for the past four years there has been so much talk about the old-age pensions without a means test. I am not imputing motives or anything of that kind to anybody.

MR. FROST: That may be all straightened out tomorrow. You cannot tell.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We still have to be shown on that point. What I am suggesting is this, that because the old-age pensions without a means test at 70, as put forward by the Dominion Government in 1945, caused so much talk following that year, that many organizations in this country, including, I do not mind saying, The United Church of Canada, in relation to a superannuation scheme, have deferred taking action which ought to have been taken with regard to their pensioners, believing, hoping and praying that one of these days the Dominion Government would "come through" with a pension of $30 a month for everybody, at the age of 70. I share the hopes of many others we will have such an arrangement in this country in the near future, and it will be of some assistance to the teachers who are now retired. But it is most unfortunate that so many people have had to suffer so long, because what was supposed to come forward in 1945, has not as yet become a reality.

Just what part that story has in the lot of retired teachers under this bill I do not know.

I want to say a word about the references made to a lobby in connection with this bill. What I have to say is a little different to what has been said. In the first place I have no objection to receiving telegrams, phone calls and other representations from people interested in a particular bill, and I expect those directly interested to be more active in coming forward than those not directly interested. What I do resent very much is that some person, or persons, unknown to me, went to great length to circulate the story that

the government itself was not too enthusiastic about this bill and apparently the opposition was not any too enthusiastic about this bill, and unless strong pressure was applied, the opposition might register objections to it and oppose it, and the government might seize the opportunity to withdraw the bill.

Speaking for myself, I do not think there was a word of truth in that in so far as either the government or the opposition was concerned.

MR. FROST: None whatever.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it is very unfortunate this was spread about. I do not think it was true with respect to the government and certainly it was not true of us. I hope we do not hear any more rumours like that in this, or any other session.

Taking into consideration the bill as a whole, I am going to vote for this bill. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of informing the government and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), who is not in his seat at this time, that we are going to have a division on this bill.

MR. FROST: Do you want to vote against it?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask a question. When you spoke about the rumour that is one particular I did not know about, but that answers the question why I got a telegram from Walter Mann, who was a candidate in Ottawa against me in two elections. He said:

"Dear George," too in the telegram.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR:

"Dear George,"

"We wholeheartedly support this bill on the superannuation for teachers."

And it was signed "Walter Mann."

MR. D. H. MORROW (PC Carleton): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the men's Teachers' Federation of Ontario, I would like to place on record my wholehearted endorsement of this superannuation bill. I do not want to prolong the discussion at all, but we are particularly pleased with this legislation with regard to superannuation benefits being paid to retired members of our profession. The hon. members have shown they are quite well aware of the meagre pension scheme presently in force. For many years the teachers have been trying to meet this situation and the Ontario Teachers' Federation have been trying to bring about those very proposals that are placed in this bill. Now, it is readily admitted that a few plans of this nature can hope to satisfy everyone. I think all schemes will lend themselves to bringing about matters like that. However, according to the Ontario Teachers' Federation executive, over 90 per cent. of the teachers of this province, both men and women teaching in all types of schools, are in favour of this new teachers superannuation Act. I can look further, perhaps, and very well agree that the bill does not go far enough, that it should include something for teachers and members of Parliament or something like that. I understand there are members outside of this House interested in that feature, and I am going to help bring it about. However, no doubt they have a justifiable reason for saying they do not receive enough consideration. According to the commission, which is as far as we can go at this time and keep our funds solvent, the teachers are very anxious to see that the fund is kept solvent and they do not want any scheme such as old-age pension schemes, but want this to be a teachers' scheme to which they contribute and pay their way. So as a teacher, I am prepared to take the advice of this commission and advice for a few years. Amendments could be made to the bill as they are feasible and desirable. I might say that "Rome was not built in a day," and, therefore, we have time to bring in amendments to this bill in the years to come, if we think there are certain amendments that require our consideration and the commission can see itself in a position to advise them.

The bill, in my opinion, will do much to increase the retirement allowance to safeguard the widows and pensions to teachers and generally enhance the profession to a degree heretofore unknown. The teachers of this province are delighted with this new bill as it stands, in my opinion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the last speaker. Does the hon. member (Mr. Morrow) think the superannuated teachers are being treated fairly by this bill? Those who are already superannuated, I mean.

MR. MORROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) would like to "put me on the spot," because I have a lot of good friends who are superannuated. I think, perhaps, in this situation you have to draw the line somewhere. They could no doubt receive better treatment, and I think they will in the not too distant future.

MR. SALSBERG: This bill?

MR. MORROW: It all depends. If I may use unparliamentary language, it depends on "whose ox is being gored." We have to draw a line somewhere. It is unfortunate that people who have just been superannuated this past year are not going to be benefited, but where are you going to draw the line? We have to draw the line somewhere. I cannot say any more than that. It is to be hoped that they may benefit more when we see our way clear to do so.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I am only going to say a word here because I can see the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is straining at the leash and wants to close the debate.

MR. PORTER: I am always delighted to listen to you.

MR. MACLEOD: Following the answer given by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Morrow) addressed to my colleague, I should like to quote a paragraph from a letter I received a day or two ago from the superannuated teachers of Ontario, and it reads as follows:

> "Please note that a teacher retired in 1949, will get $3,000 a year during his lifetime and after his demise his dependents may get $1,500 a year as long as they live, whereas a teacher who retired in 1948, gets only $1,500 a year during his lifetime and his pension dies with him."

Is that correct?

MR. PORTER: It is not, with the new amendment I was going to propose. That is corrected by the new amendment.

MR. MACLEOD: In a rather poor, mean sort of way.

MR. PORTER: There is nothing poor or mean about any amendment of mine.

MR. MACLEOD: May I put it this way, that the increase benefits which the superannuated teachers will get as a result of the amendment that you are going to bring in, does not "stack up" very well in comparison with the increase in salary which the Cabinet Ministers are going to give themselves. Is that fair?

MR. PORTER: That is just one of those irrelevant side swipes.

MR. MACLEOD: There is nothing very irrelevant about $166.66 a month, is there? It is pretty good.

MR. PORTER: If I may ask a question? Is the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) in favour of the superannuation for Cabinet Ministers?

MR. MACLEOD: I am coming to that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Immediately.

MR. MACLEOD: I am coming to that. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) said a little earlier this afternoon that he hoped the present government would be in power in 1990.

MR. PORTER: A change in personnel only.

MR. MACLEOD: I was going to say, if you stay in power until 1990, that will make you about 89 years of age; it will make the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Dunbar) 111 years of age; it will make the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) 92 years of age. Now, bearing in mind—

MR. DUNBAR: You will be an awful looking article if you live that long.

MR. MACLEOD: If you are going to try and grab yourselves $2,000 a year increase and, if you are going to stay in power until 1990, I can only suggest that there will be no need for pensioning the hon. Ministers, you will be privately superannuated. All I can say, insofar as this bill provides—

MR. DUNBAR: Shake your ear again.

MR. MACLEOD: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you might name him (Mr. Dunbar) sometime and teach him a lesson.

MR. DUNBAR: And name you "Tim Buck."

MR. MACLEOD: I am sure Mr. Buck will appreciate the plug from one of the graduates of Carleton College.

MR. DUNBAR: Cannot take it, cannot take it.

MR. MACLEOD: You are going to take the $2,000—if you can get it.

MR. DUNBAR: Dead looking.

MR. MACLEOD: I was going to say before the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Dunbar) started misbehaving so badly, as he always does when somebody is on their feet, that insofar as this bill makes provision for an adequate pension for teachers in the future, it commends itself to everybody in this Legislature. I am certain when it comes to a vote it will receive a unanimous vote.

On the other hand, it must be said that the bill does not provide for those teachers who bore the burden in the heat of the day. Nor does it do that very thing, Mr. Speaker, to which the Bible refers, it certainly does not "restore the years that the locusts have eaten." There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of teachers in this province, who were engaged in the noble profession during the period when salaries were very low. These teachers, of course, made a contribution to our society, to this province and to this nation, commensurate with the contributions that the teacher is making in 1949. I think it is only simple justice that these teachers who carried on the work of their profession during the period of low salaries, should not have to suffer the indignity of mean living in the year 1949. I think that the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that the government should find a way of investing some money in this superannuation fund to take care of the superannuated teachers, was a very sound proposal. I hope that the government will give consideration to that and try to establish a superannuation plan for all teachers in the Province of Ontario, on a just and equitable basis.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) must have found it a very bitter experience indeed to find that she would have to vote for any bill proposed by this government. I listened to her criticisms of this bill. She said she had a number of reasons why she did not like the bill, but as far as I can recollect, I only heard a very few, and if they are her only objections to the bill, I would say they are not very substantial objections, in view of the broad and great strides that the bill makes in the interests of superannuation for teachers. I am sure the hon. member (Miss Macphail) believes in her own heart that it is a very great piece of legislation in the interests, not only of the teachers now actively engaged, but for those who are at present superannuated.

In 1946, of course, the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) was not in this House on that occasion and we did not have the benefit of—I am not saying that with the slightest irony—her great experience in matters of the kind with which this bill deals. I say that without any irony whatever. However, when the hon. member (Miss Macphail) refers to me, she does so in an ironical fashion.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Mr. Speaker, it is his own fault; he invited it.

MR. PORTER: But I think you lay the foundation for the invitation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: I think you have the answer all worked out before it ever arises. I remember in 1946 there was a Superannuation Act presented to this Legislature and, I might be entirely wrong about this, but I cannot remember anything in the course of the debate at that time which drew forth the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). I do not think he wept many tears at that time for people on superannuation.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, if I did not do that I was certainly remiss in my duties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not apologize for it, I am sorry if that were true. I do not remember it.

MR. PORTER: I am not asking you to apologize, but we do not remember you, with your oratorical flair—

MR. SALSBERG: Thank you.

MR. PORTER: —mentioning superannuated teachers at that time. At that time their condition was far worse than it is today, and today provision is being made for the first time for teachers who are already superannuated. That is a new departure for any government to undertake and the reason we can do it is simply this.

I wish to emphasize in this respect that this allowance for superannuated teachers is not to be considered at all as a welfare payment, or as relief in any sense whatsoever, or public assistance. It is not to be considered—

MR. MILLARD: It does not put their pension on a proper scale.

MR. PORTER: It is not in the same category. If you wait a minute, I think you will appreciate the point when I have an opportunity of elaborating on it.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): We are better at waiting than you are, you know.

MR. PORTER: Well, I do not know.

MISS MACPHAIL: The front benches over there do not know how to wait, so I do not know why you should not "tick them off" about it.

MR. PORTER: Of course, when you look over there, Mr. Speaker, I must say for a long time I have felt I should say something about this, but this, I think, is a good opportunity: We have a very profound admiration on this side of the House for the hon. member for York East's (Miss Macphail) permanent wave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: So I hope we linger here a long time to enjoy it.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): That is the "wave of the future."

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is a dangerous subject to get on.

MR. PORTER: After all, there have been many irrelevancies, and I do not know, after all, that is so irrelevant.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): The hair does not show in *Hansard*.

MR. PORTER: Surely the hon. member (Mr. Leavens) has no distaste for a subject of that kind.

Let us just consider what this superannuation scheme has been and how it started, how it grew up, and what was the purpose of it. The whole basis of a superannuation scheme of this kind is to provide by way of contributions from members of teaching profession who are active in teaching and supplemented by contributions from the government, eventually to build up a fund which would enable pensions to be paid on a certain scale. As it was conceived in its inception, it was conceived from a point of view that the pensions would depend on the limits of the fund which would be built up. Of course, as people paid into this fund, the government also paid into the fund and most of the pensions that are paid today are paid more than half as a result of the government money which has been contributed towards these pensions, so that all pensioners today are getting not only what they paid in themselves back again, but they are also getting perhaps twice, or in some cases, more than twice, that amount of money. That was the conception upon which this fund originally was founded.

Of course, the contributions which were made in the early stages of this whole scheme were at the rate of 2½ per cent., which went on until somewhere in the neighbourhood of 1940, when they were raised to 3½ per cent., and then they were raised to 4 per cent. in 1946.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) a question with regard to that?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. NIXON: And every time the government increased their contributions proportionately and paid dollar for dollar into the fund, did they not?

MR. PORTER: No, that is not quite correct.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Oh, no.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): You people did not raise it on your idea at all. We did over here, but you did not.

MR. PORTER: You should never have asked that question.

MR. NIXON: That is all right, it will all come—

MR. PORTER: From September 1, 1932, to August 31, 1936, it was 2½ per cent. teachers, 2½ per cent. government; September 1, 1936, to August 31, 1940, it was 3 per cent. teachers and 2½ per cent. government. That was—

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): That was bad.

MR. NIXON: Not as bad as it is now, though.

MR. FROST: Just wait a minute.

MR. PORTER: Wait a minute. The government was not guaranteeing anything at all.

MR. NIXON: The government was always behind it. That is elementary, my dear Watson.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. PORTER: No. Now let us not get into that sort of a wrangle, because there was nothing in the Act, nothing in any Act, which put any responsibility on the government to pay if that fund was not sufficient to meet the claims at any time—nothing whatsoever.

In 1943-45 it was 3½ per cent. and 3½ per cent.; and in 1945 it was raised to 4 per cent. and 4 per cent. Now it is 6 per cent. and 4 per cent.—

MR. FROST: Plus 4½.

MR. PORTER: And plus 4½ per cent. interest on all accumulated funds, which, of course, is an additional government contribution in that the excess over the current rate of interest is really an additional government contribution. However, I am going to come to that in a moment.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question on that subject?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. BROWN: If at any time these teachers had to be denied a portion of their superannuation, because there was not sufficient funds to take care of it.

MR. PORTER: Oh, no, that has never happened for this reason, that the contributions coming into the fund in the past have always been more than sufficient to pay the actual claims on the fund in that year. That is how the fund has been accumulated. At the present time the $50,000,000 is the result of this surplus which arises from year to year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is that from 1917?

MR. PORTER: 1917, but the $50,000,000 has, during the last few years as a result of these increased contributions which came into the fund, been built up at a more rapid rate than it had been in the past. What I would like to emphasize is this, that the fund was conceived originally as a fund for pensions for teachers on a certain scale, on a certain basis of equal contributions that they made, not a relief scheme at all, not in any sense. It was a straightforward, definite scheme provided for teachers in that way.

As the result of the very rapid increase in those funds in the last few years, which of course resulted to a large extent from contributions of superannuated teachers or teachers who are now on superannuation, and in view of the fact that the magnitude of that fund to some extent enabled us to enter into this new scheme, it was considered only fair and just from anyway you wanted to look at it, that some recompense should be paid to teachers presently on superannuation, in view of what their contributions had made possible.

That is the justification for providing for superannuated teachers. As a matter of fact, this fund has grown proportionately faster than the Civil Service fund for instance, and other government funds, and it is for that reason we feel we are entitled to some extent to provide in this way for superannuated teachers.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) while on that particular point: How did you arrive at this figure of $10? Why was it not $20?

MR. PORTER: Well, of course, in any scheme of this kind, this sort of arrangement has to be made in a fairly rough and ready way. It is estimated—

MR. MILLARD: It is rough on those on pensions, no doubt about that.

MR. PORTER: Well, that is right; after all, I find it is extremely difficult to get anything to the nearest cent on any scheme of this kind. There are all sorts of factors which have to be taken into consideration, which vary, and in any estimate or projection into the future, it is very difficult to come to anything to the nearest cent, or dollar, or sometimes as near as $1,000,000, but it was considered it would cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of $3,000,000 to provide for these superannuated pensioners over the balance of their estimated lives, and that in relation to the $50,000,000 fund, which, of course, is also built up to a large extent by the 25,000 teachers who have contributed to it, that was a rough and ready, and approximately a fair way of dealing with this. Because, after all, they are getting their basic pension in addition to this amount which has been added. That is the basis of it.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) answer a question for clarification? He said $3,000,000—

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: He said it would cost $3,000,000—

MR. PORTER: Approximately.

MR. SALSBERG: To achieve, what? The $10 a month extra?

MR. PORTER: That would be the approximate present value of what will have to be paid—these increases to superannuated teachers.

MR. SALSBERG: That is the $10?

MR. PORTER: $10 nothing, $120 a year across the board and $600 minimum, and with increased figures in cases I have mentioned. What is the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) talking about $10 for? Not a mention of $10 anywhere.

MR. SALSBERG: Does the increase amount to $3,000,000 or not? That is what I am trying to find out.

MR. PORTER: The present value, I say—the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) understands what that means—the present value of the claims—

MR. SALSBERG: I know what your values are. Go ahead.

MR. PORTER: Yes, I know, but you know what "present value" means —would be about $3,000,000 that is what I said. That is approximately what it is. That just gives you some relative idea what it amounts to. We will look, for instance, at the present superannuated teachers and the scale of pensions, and these are the things the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) did not cry about when the Act was brought in in 1946. He did not cry at all.

MR. SALSBERG: I am crying now.

MR. PORTER: Well, I know. For instance there are today, under the old scheme which was built up from 1917, 58 pensioners receiving as low pensions as between $100 and $200. Now, every one of those 58 pensioners on April 1st will start getting $600. When the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) talks about 10 per cent. increases and that sort of thing, that is more than 100 per cent., that is just about 200 or 300 per cent. increase for those people, and those people are people who should be taken care of.

The next class is that between $200 and $300; there are 240 pensioners now getting between $200 and $300 under the old pension scheme. They will be getting $600 in each case. That is a tremendous change for them.

MR. SALSBERG: A tremendous increase, but a tremendous inadequacy just the same.

MR. PORTER: I know, but the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) said they would be "rolling in wealth." That is what she said.

MR. SALSBERG: She did not mean—

MR. PORTER: Now she says it was "irony." There are 304 pensioners receiving between $300 and $400 now who will get $600. I tell you, they would like this bill started. Receiving between $400 and $500 are 200, who will get $600, and so on—there are 1,041 pensioners who are receiving now less than $600 and who will all get $600 and some even more; if they are getting $600 now, they will get $720.

MISS MACPHAIL: You do not say.

MR. MACLEOD: How would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) like to live on $600 a year?

MR. PORTER: I am just comparing this with what has gone before.

MR. FROST: I may say this—

MR. PORTER: I am explaining this is the result of contributions that are made, and it has been worked out this way to attempt to work out something which is reasonably fair and equitable.

If we went further and said—well, we like teachers, after all, we all like them after we leave school—

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. MCEWING: Exceedingly well.

MR. PORTER: If we say because they are teachers they should have some welfare benefits beyond what any other citizen is entitled to, then where do we go? I say this, that the teachers who are now to get these increases under the Act are going to get them because, on a fair view of this whole situation, the fund has been built up as the result to a certain extent of their contribution. They are entitled to it because of what they put in, that is the right way to look

at it, and that is the way we looked at it. We have not looked at it from the point of view we would like to see them get twice as much. We would all like to see them get twice the—

MR. SALSBERG: If we all like to, they would get it. We would like it, but you would not.

MR. PORTER: In addition to that, there is this provision as to dependents, which is something I omitted to mention.

This provision as to dependents in the Act applies to teachers who are now on superannuation; under this new Act, they are entitled to the dependents' pension just as much as people who are coming on, so that I would say, in view of the circumstances this provides a very substantial increase for a very large number presently superannuated teachers. It gives something to everybody, and it gives something to dependents in cases where they might apply.

Much has been said about this aspect of the fund. I would like to remind the hon. members that now that the government is prepared to underwrite the scheme, the importance of the fund is not as great as before that was done. After all, what happens is this; in the future, when claims are made for pensions which are greater than they are today, who pays them? It will be the taxpayers at that time. It does not make the slightest difference whether those taxpayers are going to pay it as a result of the agreement to under-write the fund, or whether it is the taxpayers themselves, because all these obligations of the government are in government securities, and the fund itself consists of government stocks and debentures, and when the time comes to dip into that fund, it is the taxpayers who are going to meet the obligation to pay, under these debentures. As far as that is concerned, it is as broad as it is long.

When the fund reaches the point of $140,000,000, that is constant reminder of that obligation, and the financing of the government at that time will have to be done in relation to that obligation and that is the main purpose of building up a fund of that kind.

Here is another feature of interest in connection with the fund. Sometime around the year 1980 it may be that deficits will begin in the fund. This is altogether based upon factors which have to be considered, and if the teachers' profession increases in size, or if the teaching profession diminishes in size, then the estimate may be upset to that extent. But it is assumed that it will remain fairly constant. You will find in 1980 you have about $140,000,000 in the fund, and you have deficits gradually beginning from year to year, until at the most ten years after that they will amount to about $1,000,000 a year. That is a general estimate. With that $140,000,000 that the government have provided to meet that extra amount, which it will be called upon for at that time. That is a very manageable proposal—very manageable indeed. And it is very much better than has been suggested, to go to the extent of increasing the present contributions by the government to the fund, which really does not accomplish anything at all, until they would get to a point where they would simply inflate the fund, and it would become then just a bookkeeping entry.

MR. NIXON: Can you give us any responsible official's opinion to that effect? Surely the officers of the fund would rather have the government's contribution in there, when it is not actuarily sound today.

MR. PORTER: The Treasury is guaranteeing this. It all depends upon whether government is prepared to guarantee the scheme or not. If the government is not prepared to guarantee the scheme, then it becomes of vital importance that the annual contribution be such that it will be actuarily sound.

MR. NIXON: Then why put any money in from the government? Why does not the government just pay the deficit?

MR. MACLEOD: Are you sure you did not get this information about the books from Mrs. McCabe?

MR. FROST: No, Mr. Frier told us.

MR. PORTER: That is the simple position, Mr. Speaker. It is a government scheme. It is not a scheme of an insurance company or a municipality. It is a government scheme, backed by the financial resources of the Government of Ontario.

MR. DENNISON: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) must have had some expert look it over.

MR. PORTER: Experts look it over every three years.

MR. DENNISON: And what is their report at the present time with regard to this bill?

MR. PORTER: We have no report with regard to this particular bill. We had a report three years ago as to the position of the fund at that time, and they are working on a report this year, in the same way. They have discussed certain aspects of this, and what would happen if certain things were done, or certain things were not done. But there is no definite opinion on this particular bill, because the bill is not submitted to them, by any means.

That is the situation with respect to superannuated teachers, and for that reason I would submit to this House, Mr. Speaker, that although we would all like to see the present superannuated teachers get a great deal more than they are getting today, and we would all like to see many active teachers getting a great deal more than they are getting today in some places—and from time to time they will. But we have to look at these things from the point of view as to what is right and just in the view of the whole government's position in regard to matters of this kind. This is a recognition of the contributions which have been made, in view of the fact that the contributions which have been made have enabled us to some extent to enter into this development.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) concludes, may I say that a short time ago one of the members of the Royal Commission on Education was reported in the papers as having said that the whole question of salaries—and I presume superannuation will be attached—were dealt with in the report. If we go ahead and put this through at this time, how do we know that this will be in line with what the Royal Commission has considered, or taken under consideration, regarding the question of superannuation, in relation to salaries and the whole teaching profession.

MR. FROST: That might take another year, you know.

MR. PORTER: Yes. I just cite that as one of the many examples of how the government is going ahead, progressing by great strides, whether the report comes out or whether it does not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Furthermore, if the report comes out and recommends something that is less than this bill proposes, we will not accept that part of the report, but we will stick to the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Porter moves second reading of Bill No. 132, "The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949."

Call in the members.

The House divided.

Motion agreed to unanimously on division.

AYES: 71
NAYS: 0

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 18.

ACT RESPECTING THE CITY OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 18th Order; second reading of Bill No. 23, "An Act respecting the City of Toronto," Mr. Rea.

MR. C. E. REA (PC St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second

reading of Bill No. 23, "An Act respecting The City of Toronto."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on this bill on second reading, and it being 6 o'clock, I wonder if you want me to proceed now, or after we reconvene, because I am going to speak on this bill at some length.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Move the adjournment.

MR. SALSBERG: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 19th Order.

ACT RESPECTING THE CITY OF OTTAWA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 19th Order; second reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa," Mr. Chartrand.

MR. C. C. CALDER (L London): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Chartrand, I move second reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6 of the clock, I do leave the Chair.

—It being 6 of the clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at 8.00 p.m.

HON. L. M. FROST (Treasurer): 66th Order.

THE POLICE ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 66th Order, second reading of Bill No. 108, "The Police Act, 1949." Mr. Blackwell.

On presentation of birthday cake to Hon. Mr. Porter (Minister of Education).

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I want, on behalf of the official Opposition, to extend to my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) the felicitations of all of us on this side of the House on this memorable anniversary and present to him a cake with four candles celebrating the fourth birthday of the Royal Commission on Education. While we cannot express the wish that there will be many happy returns of the day, we do wish to convey our hopes for a successful and prosperous future.

HON. D. PORTER (Minister of Education): Of course, I cannot speak for the commission.

On presentation of cake.

HON. MR. PORTER: Is this a bomb? "Compliments of the primary class in arithmetic." Of course, Mr. Speaker, I am overcome with this very touching recognition of my mathematical prowess and also receiving this gastronomic masterpiece which no doubt came out of one of the home economics classes of one of our schools.

I do not know what is in this; it is either a bomb or a chestnut. I wish to thank the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail), but I do not know from which hon. member this came.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Not from East York.

HON. MR. PORTER: In the course of the first presentation, I did not notice any other member who came over with this one. I think this should be forwarded to the proper recipients, and since the Royal Commission is not represented in this House, I should undertake to see it is delivered to the proper recipients. In view of the fact the celebration is at an end and the hon. members have expressed the view that there should be many happy returns of the day—

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, no.

HON. MR. PORTER: I think, to satisfy the hon. members that the work of this commission will come to a close at the very earliest possible moment, I shall blow out the candles.

HON. L. E. BLACKWELL (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 108, The Police Act, 1949.

MR. J. L. EASTON (CCF Wentworth): Is the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) going to give any explanation of any changes to be made in the Act at this time?

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Easton) that I intend to make some observations on second reading of this bill. The first thing I should do so that any debate which may ensue shall proceed with the proper perspective on the bill, I might indicate at this point that if the bill goes to committee I will there move the same modifications in principle as I indicated I would move in committee on the Fire Department subject and so we can now entertain what may be said in the House in relation to that proposal.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that again this bill, for the purpose of convenience, is divided into a number of parts.

All of the parts, other than Part 3, represent a consolidation and revision of the existing statute and in all the parts, other than Part 3, there is one change in principle of some importance, and that is the chiefs of police, on the theory that they are chief executive officers of the municipality, are removed from the collective bargaining provisions.

I feel, however, to place the bill before the House in the proper prospectus that I should make some reference to its evolution. There is a distinction, in the first place, in the degree by which this bill affects what has been described as "municipal autonomy." Since time immemorial, the police officer has been recognized as an officer of the Crown. Whether or not he may be actually hired or paid in a particular municipality, he has always been subject to some legal obligations that have not applied to any other class of municipal employee, including, of course, firemen.

Another example of the distinction is that many of the municipal police forces in the Province of Ontario have been under the direction of police commissions—a great number of them—and in that respect police forces have never been under the direct direction and control of many municipal councils to the same degree as other persons employed by and paid by the municipality.

Another important distinction is that quite aside from the provisions at present contained in the Police Act, it has always been illegal for the police officer to strike.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Always?

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: Ever since I can remember, and certainly according to the law which was in existence when this government took office in this province.

Another point that should be borne in mind is under our statutes for a long time in this province the requirements as to efficient policing of municipalities have been found in the statute and, of course, are in the Police Act, quite aside from the new feature of this bill.

There is, of course, the additional, further infringement, if you may so describe it, of the autonomy of municipalities in the matter of collective bargaining, because the municipalities again have permitted to develop associations which proceed to collective bargaining. Under this statute as under the Fireman's Act the province felt it necessary to provide workable collective bargaining provisions in order to avoid difficulty and trouble that was developing under the existing circumstances. Under these circumstances I feel I should review the development found in the parts of this bill that represent a consolidation over the last two years since 1944.

The hon. members of this House will recognize or remember that our legislation of 1944 permitted agreements to be made between the province and municipalities whereby the municipalities could purchase provincial policing from the province. There are now in existence some 64 of these agreements under which some 136 members of the Ontario

Provincial Police Force are engaged in municipal police duty.

Now, it should be borne in mind that since the inception of these agreements in 1944 the province has been indirectly subsidizing the municipalities that have entered into these agreements, the reason being that the charge made under these agreements, as far as the men are concerned, has been $1,750 per year, whereas the cost to the province is between $2,300 and $2,400 per year. So it should be borne in mind that since 1944 the province has been subsidizing some municipalities in policing municipalities which have bought provincial policing.

I think I should mention that at this stage because it is an indication of an effort to subsidizing generally for municipal policing. It simply leaves this conception that no effort whatsoever is being made to in any way force provincial policing because of that subsidy.

The next thing is the provision that the municipality will receive a subsidy whether or not they buy provincial policing from the province, so rather than having any interference with the autonomy of municipalities, we have directly the reverse attitude.

The designation of policing responsibility under the Act of 1946, without going into too much detail, simply meant that urban policing in Ontario was by statute made the responsibility of cities and towns, and urban areas designated as being responsible by Order-in-Council. I feel at this point I should put this forward, Mr. Speaker, as another example of how provincial administration has avoided arbitrary dealing in this respect. When these designations which number somewhat in excess of two hundred were made, rather than an Order-in-Council being passed and an area being designated, what actually was done was tentative designations were sent out to the municipalities in question and they were invited to make any representations they saw fit wtih regard to the suitability of the designations. In some cases they made representation which led to quite substantial changes in some of the designations on the basis of the facts they presented. Now, other than that in 1946 for the first time the provincial administration accepted an absolute statutory responsibility for the policing of rural Ontario. I feel, tonight, I should make some reference to what this means to the province in the matter of the size of the Provincial Police Force.

Prior to these steps being taken, that is about 1943, with the exception of veterans guards looking after Hydro plants, the Provincial Police Force numbered, including officials, 473 men. Today, without counting the 136 provincial police who are on municipal duty, the strength of the Ontario Provincial Police Force for the purpose of policing rural Ontario, is 871, including officials.

Some other features of the legislation in the last few years, are the introduction into the Police Act in 1947, as was done in the Fire Department Act, of the very same collective bargaining provision on behalf of police as on behalf of firemen. The only difference is that the firemen were in local unions of the A.F. of L. union and the police were in the Police Association with an Ontario Federation. However, there was the very same collective bargaining provision applied to each. At the same time, in 1947, provision was made that police in the province could have no outside union affiliations. The reason for that was their job was to represent all of the citizens and all interests in the province and, therefore, affiliation with any particular group in the community was unsound and might raise a conflict of duty and interest in the discharge of their functions. Also for good and sufficient reasons, the provisions applicable to police in Britain, under the legislation there, were incorporated into our statute.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming to section 2 of the bill, which contains new subsidy provisions, the percentage of subsidies paid to municipalities according to their need, is exactly in the same percentages as contained in the Fire Department Act. In principle, I do not feel it is necessary for me to elaborate those police services which create an eligibility for subsidy as numerated in the section.

There is also a provision, as in the

Fire Department Act, whereby one municipality may buy its policing from another municipality, that also creates that eligibility for subsidy.

That brings to mind one interesting thing in the province, that is with reference to the King's Highway in Niagara Falls. Instead of Niagara Falls hiring policing from the province, as it was convenient and reasonable to do so there, the province turned around and purchased policing within Niagara Falls from the municipality. That is just another indication that, rather than trying to interfere with the autonomy of municipalities, in cases like that, we purchase policing from them without any thought of interference with the autonomy of the province.

Now, I feel that there was such comprehensive debate on the question of the brief presented by the municipalities last October, and the correspondence between the Mayors and Reeves Association and my colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), and the consultation that I had with them, and the report I made to the Cabinet, I do not need to review that. What I said there applies just as definitely to policing. We get down to the very same question that the municipalities had the same attitude in connection with collective bargaining provisions in the Police Act and their effect on wages and working conditions as in the Fire Department Act and what they would have liked to have done was abolish collective bargaining. Again I say that policing is so important not only for the single municipality but throughout the province that I do not think there is a single hon. member in the Legislature who would have supported the proposal that the police be deprived of their collective bargaining rights. I want to say at this point that the municipalities need not be alarmed at the thought that the Provincial Department holds the opinion that there should be one policeman to every 1,000 of population. I would like to point out that there is a great difference in policing needs of various municipalities and that must be taken into account.

For instance, in large urban centres such as Toronto and Windsor there is one policeman to considerably less than 1,000 of population, whereas in a county town elsewhere in the province the policing problems are so entirely different that no such ratio to police is required. I wanted to make it clear that we have no such conception of efficiency in mind.

Now, this bill is predicated, as far as the Attorney-General's Department is concerned, on those two principal points. The third is for the purpose of meeting policing needs throughout Ontario. The collective bargaining provision has been onerous on the municipalities and, second, we recognize the necessity of meeting these standards not only as a matter of peacetime policing but in case of national emergency, which causes further expense. On these two bases, it appealed to the government as being a justifiable matter of provincial policy. I would like to indicate to you just how important this is. Today there pours across my desk, almost daily, editorials from such papers as *The Times* of London, the Manchester *Guardian,* also news reports, letters to editors and everywhere in the British press today is a concern about the deterioration of policing in Britain in the face of one of the most difficult crime situations in history. The situation today is that the Metropolitan Police Force of London, which was regarded as a model for all police forces of the world, is 5,000 men under strength. The administration is desperately calling for 15,000 volunteers to work part-time to fill it up. Scotland Yard, which has been internationally famous as a criminal investigation branch has undergone a similar deterioration because the wages and working conditions of policemen are such that they do not attract or retain the service of the type of citizen that has the basic qualifications to make a policeman.

Today, in Britain a coal miner gets more than a policeman and the lack of a proper adjustment has made the law enforcement not only bad in peacetime, but placed it in a really serious position

in case of national security should it be needed.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Do you think a coal miner is entitled to less than a policeman?

MR. BLACKWELL: I do suggest that the ratio used to be otherwise.

MR. MacLEOD: He works pretty hard.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am not making any criticism of his industry but there are those who think, in this modern age, that the educational standards of a policeman are required to be a little higher and that usually carries with it a little greater monetary reward. I do think, for instance, that the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), in view of their educational standards and their importance in the Communist Party, probably draw down a little more than the ordinary members in the cells.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): You would never join the party because you do not get paid more.

MR. BLACKWELL: I know you do not like anything about policing.

MR. SALSBERG: Nor about those who have police minds.

MR. BLACKWELL: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, having indicated at this point the modifications which are proposed in this bill, if it reaches committee stage, it gives me satisfaction to move second reading of this measure in the House. I believe it will improve matters to a point where the municipalities are not under the strain they are now in maintaining the present standards and where our personnel and equipment will be improved, not only for peacetime purposes but also that our police force may be efficient, they may be loyal, they may be qualified in case this country should have to meet a national emergency.

MR. J. L. EASTON (CCF Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks I would like to say that very few bills have given as much trouble to experienced men than Bills No. 107 and 108, which have to do with the Police and Fire Departments of this province. Despite the assurances of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that there is nothing in this bill to denote why he must police the municipalities which are already policed, unfortunately, I must base my argument on what is contained in the bill. There are changes suggested and printed in the bill and I must base my argument on what is contained there and not on what is in the mind of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and of which we have no knowledge at the present time.

It is unfortunate that bills should be presented here containing many undesirable features as well as desirable features and the government should expect us to swallow them "holus-bolus." The policy of sugaring the pill to hide its bitter taste is one which does not fool hon. members on this side of the House. The bitter taste of this bill, No. 108, gives the right of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to enforce certain sanctions on municipalities in the event that the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) department does not see eye-to-eye with local municipalities on policing. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has offered as an excuse to introduce this bill that it is necessary to have this power in case of a national emergency. He made a very reasonable case in Bill 107, but I see a vast difference in the principle and that principle is contained in Bill 108. To repeat his main arguments, he stated, "The new system of grants to Police and Fire Departments is tied up with the desire of the Ontario Government to strengthen these services as part of an over-all plan for improving national defences in the event of war." What support has the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) received in relation to this argument with relation to police departments? I would draw your attention to a statement that was made by the hon. Brooke Claxton, quoted in the *Hamilton Spectator:*

"Hon. Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Defence, this morning endorsed the statement made yesterday in Toronto by Ontario Attorney-General Leslie Blackwell, that the new system of grants to Police and Fire Departments is tied up with the Ontario Government's desire to strengthen these services as part of a plan for improving national defence in the event of war. The hon. Mr. Claxton confined his comments to the Fire Departments, saying that the situation regarding police forces was a matter for the provinces and the municipalities."

So that there cannot be any strengthening of his argument based on that point.

Then, quoting again:

"Mr. Claxton said that this was in line with discussions already held by his department and the course followed since he had appointed General F. F. Worthington as co-ordinator of civilian defence. Since that time, he said, the matter had been discussed with the Premiers of the nine provinces."

But, nevertheless, there is nothing there that strengthens the hon. Attorney-General's argument that this bill is necessary in the event of a national emergency.

Then, quoting:

"Mr. Claxton added that he was of the opinion that there would not be war, 'at least not for some time,' commenting, 'The Russians do not want it; they know they'd lose it'."

If it is not established that this bill would be of any use in a national emergency and until the identity of the enemy is established or named by the hon. Attorney-General, then I can only assume the enemy is who he has in mind, and I assume that that enemy is organized labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh. That is not so.

MR. EASTON: I am speaking from experience. The history of industrial troubles in this province has been written in the records of the police court, jails, hospitals and the graveyards, and the records show that in larger centers, where policing is under local authorities, there has been less disorder and violence than in those areas where the provincial police have been called in. I quote the Mayor of Hamilton, Sam Lawrence, as to how he feels about it, and you will agree he is a man of long and wide experience:

"City Police—wants force kept free from Queen's Park rule. Would prefer grants going to social work. Hamilton Police Department is 'equally as efficient as the provincial police, anyway,' Mayor Sam Lawrence said today, discussing the 'strings' attached to provincial government grants to municipalities to 'approved' Police and Fire Departments. 'We should not be asked to give up any more of our autonomy over Fire and Police Departments,' said the Mayor."

I go along with the Mayor of Hamilton in my remarks.

HON. L. M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Does my hon. friend (Mr. Easton) know that has been fully met in the wording of the Act?

MR. EASTON: No, because I believe there is no point in here which I can get out of it which is not in accordance with the suggested amendment made by the Attorney-General. You can refer to that now, that is Chapter 48, Section 1. I would say that anything short of a national emergency the administration of a police force should remain entirely within the confines of the municipalities desiring the same. Any decision to be made on the enforcement in any municipality should be made by the local authorities free and unfettered by any grants and strings made and attached to such grants. During the steel strike in Hamilton in 1946, I had good reason to observe the conduct of their local police, and I want to say their conduct was beyond reproach

—the patience and understanding in the way they handled the picket lines in one of the largest and most important strikes in the history of Canada, was a tribute to the local government which could not have been attained by bringing in outside provincial police. So I say let us leave the municipalities to do their own policing.

MR. FROST: They did bring in the provincial police.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): I think the principle the municipalities object to in this bill more than any other is the fact that the government did not discuss this matter with them prior to bringing in the bill. It is true that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) now proposes to withdraw some at least of the objectionable sections in the bill, but I am sure if he had consulted the municipalities before he introduced the bill in the first place, he would not have put those objectionable sections in the bill when the bill was introduced. Now, what some of the municipalities are afraid of—and I have had a number of letters in connection with this bill—one from an alderman in the town of Orillia, and he says what the municipalities are afraid of is that the government is attempting to set up a state police force in this province. He says:

> "In Orillia's case, under the present terms, the provincial police would take over this town with a ten-man force and it would not cost the town hardly any more money than it cost us to operate our own 6-man force in 1948."

In other words, the government give them generous assistance in order to get a municipality to do away with the local police and accept provincial policing, and he says he believes that is a step in the wrong direction. It is a step towards centralization which he strongly opposes, and which I notice Mr. Drew in Ottawa speaks very strongly against when he suggests it is done by the Federal Government, and he goes on to say that if the province wants to help policing, he believes they should have increased their one-mill subsidy and give this one-mill or one-mill-and-a-half subsidy to the municipality with no strings attached.

MR. FROST: Who said that?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Farmer Tissington, an alderman in the Town of Orillia.

MR. FROST: Is he speaking for the council?

MR. DENNISON: He says it is not official, but a number of members of the local municipal government have discussed this with him and he says he represents their opinions on the bill.

HON. L. M. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Is he reliable?

MR. DENNISON: Yes, he is a very reliable gentleman, Mr. Attorney-General, and I am sure he has a real interest in making the police force in the Town of Orillia an efficient force.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he CCF?

MR. DENNISON: He is a manufacturer, and a large manufacturer, but that would also recommend his statements, Mr. Attorney-General, as being very sound and very sensible.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): If he comes from Orillia, he must be good.

MR. DENNISON: He does not object to this bill on the ground of any bargaining section in the bill, and I am quite sure that the City of Toronto did not object to this bill on the ground of bargaining. I believe they objected to this bill on the ground of provincial interference with the rights and privileges the municipalities have enjoyed heretofore in this Province of Ontario, and when the province whittles away on those rights and privileges and powers, that you previously gave your municipalities you cannot expect them to let these privileges be removed from their grasp bit by bit.

MR. FROST: Would my hon.

friend (Mr. Dennison) tell me any rights taken away from municipalities in these bills?

MR. DENNISON: The greatest privilege you take away from them is the privilege of deciding how they are going to pay their own funds.

MR. FROST: No, you are quite wrong.

MR. DENNISON: I think the funds that you gave to the municipalities under the one-mill subsidy—you must remember the larger municipalities at least, that was a fund they previously had when they had the right to share in the income tax. When you took away from them the right to that share of the income tax you substituted this one-mill subsidy. Now, you propose to remove from their hands the one-mill subsidy and substitute therefor grants to which you hold the string, and the municipalities, I think, will very rightly object to the government holding the strings.

MR. FROST: The principal of this bill and subsidy provision contained, is exactly the same as the subsidy provision contained in the bill that you voted for this afternoon, in connection with fire departments.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Minister, we will support you to some extent in these bills, but you ask more than is reasonable. You ask more than is reasonable when you have the municipalities hamstrung in the way you propose to do, with this bill.

MR. FROST: In what way are they "handsome"?

MR. DENNISON: Let me just give you an example of what I think may happen in this province. After all, if we are going to have good municipal government in this province, we must give that government enough powers and privileges that responsible people will run for municipal office. I heard a man from Peterborough say the other day he had been down on three deputations to see a certain department about a certain matter which previously the municipalities had complete authority over; he said the other day: "If the province continues to take away our authority and power in these matters, I am going to stop running for municipal council, because all we are and have become are just 'rubber stamps' for the departments at Queen's Park." Now, I hope—

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Let us know about Peterborough. What power is taken away from Peterborough?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Minister, previously the municipality had certain powers in connection with setting up high schools. Today they have to make far more trips down to the Department of Education in connection with setting up high schools than they had before. The strings are being—

AN HON. MEMBER: And they love it.

MR. DENNISON: The strings are being tightened and tightened each year. That is what municipalities object to. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), in some of the objectionable passages—and I am glad he is going to remove these, because let me just review some of the objectionable passages—one of them requires that the municipality, to get a grant under this Police Act, would have to submit a report to the provincial police, who would, in turn, submit a return to the Minister in charge of Revenue, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost); who would in turn give, not the whole grant, but only half the grant, and give it after the first of November in the year in which it was applied for. In other words, so late in the season, the municipality might have to borrow the money to look after their department up until that time.

And even then, they only get half the amount.

MR. FROST: Does my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) know when the one-mill subsidy was paid, whether it was paid in arrears or in advance?

MR. DENNISON: I do not think you kept them waiting for the one-mill

subsidy till the first of November. They got the amount in May—April, May or June, or thereabouts.

MR. FROST: I do not think so.

MR. DUNBAR: Not till the fall.

MR. DENNISON: Now you propose to wait till November the first.

MR. FROST: But under his arrangement they get one-half in the spring and one-half in the fall. The one-mill subsidy was all in the fall.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are learning something every day.

MR. DENNISON: That is not the way I read these objectionable sections of the Act, but I am glad you have taken these sections out, because I think this—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: I think these sections were preposterous.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Why bother debating them if they are out?

MR. DENNISON: Pardon?

MR. BLACKWELL: Why bother debating them if they are out?

MR. DENNISON: Well, I want to say you are very—

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreeable.

MR. DENNISON: —wise in taking these sections out.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): We will accept that.

MR. DENNISON: I want to continue this by saying that had you discussed this with the municipalities, these preposterous sections would not have been put in, I am sure. In other words, you people should take the municipalities into your trust and deal with them man to man, not as a father to a stepchild, or something like that, but deal with them man to man, and discuss this as an equal partnership.

I notice the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) states that he has certain reports—

AN HON. MEMBER: He wrote his speech too soon.

MR. DENNISON: —passed across his desk—I believe that is the term he used.

AN HON. MEMBER: He never reads them.

MR. DENNISON: Apparently he is reading these reports.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Reminiscent of Osborne-Dempster.

MR. DENNISON: I am glad he has started to read the reports that "pass across his desk," because I can remember the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) standing up before a Royal Commissioner and admitting that he did not read reports one time that "passed across his desk," and he was in the embarrassing position of having to admit that of some 43 reports which passed across his desk, he only read one of them.

MR. MACLEOD: And he was reprimanded by the Royal Commission for not reading them.

MR. DENNISON: And he claimed he did not know anything about the matter at all for nearly three years, because he did not read reports "passing across his desk." Now, I am glad to see the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is becoming more and more aware of these reports that "pass across his desk." I would like to see him also pay a little more attention to the appeals of the municipalities which "pass across his desk."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Would my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) say when he wrote that speech? It is pretty much out of date, is it not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: You have to be a little behind time to deal with a government like this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: We are always a leap ahead of you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, there are two items about this bill that I wish to comment on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Only two?

MR. SALSBERG: That is all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: A little noise from "little Chicago." The first thing I would appreciate an explanation on from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is on page 2, sub-section 3. I assume it is an old sub-section, there is nothing new in it, but I confess to more than curiosity about this sub-section.

It says that,

> "Where, by reason of the establishment of any enterprise or because of any other reason, special circumstances or abnormal conditions exist in any area which, in the opinion of the Attorney-General, would render it inequitable that responsibility for policing should be imposed on any municipality or the province, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may designate such area a special area and may require any company operating such enterprise or being the owner of such area to enter into an agreement for the policing of such area under sections so and so."

I confess I fail to understand it, and would appreciate some enlightenment. What I am afraid of is this—

MR. BLACKWELL: Is this a question now?

MR. SALSBERG: This is part of what I am about to say, in this first part; this one is in the form of a question, but I advise the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell)—

MR. BLACKWELL: Would you like me to answer it?

MR. SALSBERG: The other, the second part, will be by way of telling you something.

MR. BLACKWELL: Would you like me to answer your questions?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, but permit me to finish it.

MR. BLACKWELL: All right.

MR. SALSBERG: In order to finish the first part, which is the question, what I am concerned with is this, that if an area requires policing, then I think that policing should be done by you, sir, Mr. Attorney-General. Now, believe it or not, I want you to do policing—I had rather we make no provision for private companies to be responsible for policing under any circumstances. If policing is required, that is a job for the provincial police or the municipal police, but not private policing.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is what the section is to provide for.

MR. SALSBERG: But the section also permits private policing, and only when they fail to police it, you police it for them and charge them.

MR. BLACKWELL: No, you are quite wrong. I explained it all to you last year. If you will let me explain now—

MR. SALSBERG: Well—

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) may recall that when the provisions now found in this bill were introduced in 1947, during the Legislature of 1947, I think it was, he brought up this particular point, and at that time, in committee, I indicated to him that this was taking a power under the province to designate those areas which

were company areas as "policing areas," and that the practice had been followed when we designated them, we entered into a policing agreement so that the policing was done by the province and not by the private companies.

MR. SALSBERG: But they may continue to do their own policing if they so desire. That is the point, and that has not been altered. I recall quite well discussing this point, but I see in the bill we continue the provision for private policing, which in my opinion is wrong and should not be permitted. Under all circumstances, policing if required and justified, is the task of the state, of the federal or provincial or municipal governments.

Now, then, that was by way of question.

The second point I want to deal with is that which denies the right of joining a trade union to members of the police force. That is Section 26 of the bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: Comes the revolution.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is to stop Communist infiltration into the police force, you see.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) thinks this is a "wisecrack."

MR. BLACKWELL: No, it is a serious matter.

MR. SALSBERG: I suggest to him that today he should steer clear of any such attempt. I think he has retreated so often and so far back he is not in a mood to "wisecrack." Just let him deal with matters as they come before the House, in a proper manner.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is what I am doing.

MR. SALSBERG: I suggest this section of the law should be removed, should not be included in the new Act. The rights of a policeman to join a trade union compare well with the rights of any worker to join the union of his trade, or his association.

AN HON. MEMBER: Next you will want to unionize the Army.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) made a reply earlier to a question I put to him that, as far as he remembers, the police were always denied the right to strike. Well, I remember the police force of Toronto went out on strike.

MR. BLACKWELL: You probably had something to do with it.

MR. SALSBERG: I remember them picketing the streets of the city.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): You were picketing them, did you say?

MR. SALSBERG: Certainly the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is old enough to remember that strike in 1919?

MR. PORTER: I just asked if you were picketing. I thought you said you were.

MR. SALSBERG: I said the police force of Toronto was on strike. They picketed, and they gave the city free policing without charge. That was their way of picketing.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is the Boston strike you are thinking of.

MR. SALSBERG: I remember that very distinctly, but I do not remember any charges being laid against any members of the Toronto police force, and I am quite certain when they struck in 1919 it was because they failed to get satisfaction otherwise.

I would not even deny the police the right to strike. I certainly would not deny them the right to join a trade union, as this Section 26 specificially denies them. I know there are certain areas where this right is denied policemen, but I know of areas where this right is granted and where they exercise it. There are certain police forces in this country that are affiliated to a legitimate trade union centre, and I think they should have that right in Toronto or in

any other area of this province, including the provincial police.

This may sound astounding to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). I see nothing wrong. He need not worry there will be "infiltration," I am sure he will take care to see there will be no infiltration, but certainly they should have the right to affiliate with a trade union.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) went out of his way to acquaint the House with the position of the Ontario Federation of Labour in regard to some matters this afternoon. We all agreed with those matters which he referred to, but he is also undoubtedly aware of the sentiment that exists in the ranks of organized labour on this point, that is, that they feel the policemen should have the right to freely associate themselves with other bodies or organized labour.

In Montreal a little while ago the policemen were organized and they joined the Canadian Congress of Labour. I might tell hon. members of the House I was there as an observer at the convention of the Canadian Congress of Labour in Montreal. In 194— what year was that?

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): 1943. You are always around when there is a Congress convention.

MR. PORTER: Ever been there since?

MR. SALSBERG: With more right than a lot of others who have been there.

AN HON. MEMBER: They should have thrown you out.

MR. SALSBERG: We will discuss that elsewhere. However, I was at that convention and I felt quite good to look around and see a whole unit of the police force sitting among the delegates, raising their hands, voting for resolutions, getting up on the floor and speaking—that was very nice, very proper, I thought. Since then, I understand the Quebec Provincial Government has denied that right. I do not think we should emulate Duplessis; I think we should, in this province, grant the rights of organization, the freedom of affiliation, to the members of our police force, whether they are on the municipal or on the provincial level.

I spoke against this section when the bill was before the House last. I do say now that I do not see how this bill can be voted for so long as this section is included.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (CCF Ontario): Mr. Speaker, one thing we should remember is that the present grants are to take the place of the one-mill subsidy. Now, the one-mill provincial subsidy had strings attached to it, and it certainly was no gift by the provincial government. It was given to the municipalities to compensate them for the loss of the personal income tax. If the one-mill subsidy is removed, then I think any further grants should have no further "strings" attached to them at all; they should just be a straight grant.

It is said the object of the bill is to provide greater efficiency in the police departments. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) said the provincial police will operate in any municipality at the present time at a saving of about 25 per cent. chargeable to the particular municipality. That offer was a very attractive one, and I think it has operated since 1946, but not many municipalities have swallowed this very attractive bait. Maybe the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) will tell us how many in the Province of Ontario.

MR. BLACKWELL: I did. 64.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): 64? It would seem that few municipalities are of the opinion the provincial police system is an improvement on their own. Also the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) mentioned that no pressure is brought to bear on the municipal government to introduce the provincial police.

I do know of one occasion when pressure was brought to bear on the municipal council to establish the provincial police.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) said on Wednesday afternoon that the government would "make this scheme work." I am surprised that he would defy the local governments in this way, because the local governments comprise men and women, who are, I think, much closer to the people than the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell).

MR. MACLEOD: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Where have we defied the local governments in this bill?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I beg your pardon?

MR. FROST: Where have we defied the local governments in this bill?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): You are defying them in the fact one day last week you said you intended "to make this scheme work."

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): And against the—

MR. FROST: No, no, no. The municipalities raised certain objections, and the objections are all out of the bill now.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Oh, no, they are not.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): You said last week you intended to "make this scheme work" against the better judgment of the municipalities at the present time.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): They are objecting to it. Another point, Mr. Speaker; is the Police Department subject to an additional audit? Certain municipalities have auditors coming in there for highways, welfare, workmen's compensation, hydro, income tax and unemployment insurance; is this to be another set of auditors to come in and audit the books of the municipality, with the supervisors as well? That is going to be added expense to the municipalities, and though they will get some grants from the provincial government, it is going to cost them more money for supervision. I think it would be better for the provincial government to leave this service alone and concentrate on services that do not receive grants on assessment or population.

I think even on a population basis, grants would tend to give the larger municipalities a little more than their share. Why not concentrate on unemployment relief, health service and old-age pensions?

I think the government should withdraw the bill pending consultation with the municipal authorities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. D. NAULT (PC Russell): Mr. Speaker, this is not a speech I am going to make. I shall only give an answer to my hon. friend, the member next to me, for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), I believe.

MR. MACLEOD: He is listening.

MR. NAULT: He is listening. However, I am going to speak as a union man myself of long standing, and, I believe, as good a union man as any in this hall today.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NAULT: I must say I do not agree the police force should belong to any outside unions, because they are formed into a force to keep peace and order, and they have enough trouble to keep it now without belonging to another organization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I only intend to say a word or two on the bill, because I can see that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is anxious to reply to those who have

already spoken. If it were not for the fact the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) announced in advance he was making some changes in the original bill, there would be just cause for a more prolonged debate. However, I think hon. members of the House should feel sympathy for the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) in the unhappy position in which he finds himself, having had to retreat rather ignominiously on two occasions within the short space of a few hours.

I think it can be said that his colleagues in the government have treated him rather shabbily. As a matter of fact, I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) finds himself in this unhappy position as the result of a "gang-up" by his colleagues on the treasury benches.

I think they encouraged him to introduce these bills in their orginal form in order to discredit him in the eyes of his own party—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: —and in the eyes of the citizens of this province—

AN HON. MEMBER: You have us laughing now.

MR. MACLEOD: —in order to undermine his chances of winning the moth-eaten mantle of leadership—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: —of the Tory party. I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell)—

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did you not vote for them?

MR. MACLEOD: I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has good reason to question the loyalty of those surrounding him.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) confine himself to the principle of the bill we have under discussion.

MR. MACLEOD: I am coming to that.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think discussion of leadership has anything to do with this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. R. DENT (PC Oxford): He is advance agent for the convention.

MR. SPEAKER: I do feel we have enough to do to discuss the principle of the bill without wandering into various extraneous matters.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling, but I do not think I have been more irrelevant than some of those who have preceded me. However, if I have been irrelevant, I assure you the irrelevancies are past.

My own feelings about this bill are comparable to the feelings I have had about the bills which have preceded it. I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) in his announcement of certain amendments has gone some distance in meeting the objections to the bill as set out by the municipalities of this province.

There is one section of the bill, however, that I cannot support, and that is the section which denies the right to bargaining and the right to join a union on the part of the members of the police force.

I say that, recognizing fully the right of my hon. friend to the rear of me (Mr. Nault) to hold views to the contrary. I do not question for a moment the statement the hon. member (Mr. Nault) made, that he is as good a trade unionist as anyone who sits in this room. I accept that. I do not quarrel with it at all, but the hon. member (Mr. Nault) must accord the right to others who belong to trade unions to their own opinion. I think it is wrong to put the policemen in a different category from any other class of worker. They are wage earners, they perform a public service, and I take strong exception to the remark made by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that we who sit over here recoil at the mere mention of the word "policeman."

Policemen are a part of our society, and necessary to maintain law and order, and to guard the community against those who would undermine law and order. What we do object to is the improper use of police by governments, and I say that the present hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) of the Province of Ontario is guilty of the improper use of provincial police in this province, and there are tens of thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands of trade unionists in the Province of Ontario who believe precisely that. If I wanted to take the time I could cite many examples where the provincial police of this province have been sent in to communities to thwart the efforts of working people to win proper wages, proper working conditions, and the right of collective bargaining. I do not care who the Attorney-General is in the Province of Ontario, I object to him having the power to interfere with the just, economic struggle waged by the trade unionists by sending the police in to assist the company which is determined to smash the attempts at legitimate trade union organization. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, while agreeing with many of the provisions in the bill as amended, we cannot possibly support a measure which denies to policemen the rights enjoyed by other wage earners in the Province of Ontario. That suggests there is a difference in the loyalty of one class of workers as against another. I believe the vast majority of organized workers in this province are loyal and desire to see our society proceed in an orderly fashion. I see no reason in the world why policemen should be set aside and made subject to the will of government which may desire to use the police for improper purposes.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has in this bill eliminated the objectionable sections, in the same way as he did for the Fire Departments bill, and in so doing I can find no particular objection to it, except to say that I am just a little apprehensive of the financial result which will ultimately come to the municipalities. I have been doing a little figuring, and I find that actually the bill providing a subsidy for my own city, for instance, would be completely eliminated by the amount paid to the Fire Department and the Police Department, in other words, these two departments would get the full extent of the one-mill subsidy, which means the other essential services in our municipality would have to get along as best they can. I sincerely trust this department will view the results—

MR. FROST: Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Brown) agree that the payment by government for the amounts for police and fire actually amount to one-mill, but actually the other things which are there, the subsidies for good roads, the increase in other services, will amount to more than the one-mill subsidy.

MR. BROWN: I appreciate that, but my point is this; that since these two departments are going to receive this $37,500, they will find some way to spend it, therefore, it will be spent by those two departments.

I am not quarrelling with the idea, but I would suggest that the government review very carefully how these monies are being expended, so at the end of next year they can say whether it has been beneficial or not. I am just a little bit apprehensive about it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made clear before the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) speaks again—if he is going to speak again—that not all of the principles which are objectionable in this bill have been removed by any means. I will not take the time of the House tonight to deal with them in detail, as we will have a great deal more to say about them when they reach committee stage.

When the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) was speaking it was on the basis that he would give an outline of the changes he proposes to move in committee. He did that this afternoon, and he has done it again tonight. If that were taken at face value and we

could rely on that as being the understanding on which second reading is asked for, that is one thing, but if, on the other hand, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has something else in mind, that is another story. I will give one example of what little trust we can put in assurances of this kind, in connection with bills of this sort.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is responsible for the wording of the bill which is now before the House, and scattered throughout the bill there are what might be called "editorial comments" for the assistance of the hon. members of this House. A number of sections are marked "new," or "amended," or "part," as the case may be. I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) must take responsibility for these notes, as well as for the text, because it either leads the hon. members of the House, or it misleads them, when the bill is being studied;

I am not satisfied with the conditions of these notes. It only goes to show that we are not in a position to accept the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr Blackwell) explanation of what he later proposes to move in committee, until we see the amendments in committee.

The example I was going to cite was that of Section 48, which I will not discuss in detail, but which I will give only as an example. Section 48 appears in the bill as though it were not new, as though there was nothing new about it. Reference is made to 1947, chapter 77, section 11; 1948, chapter 68, section 7, and to 1946, chapter 721, section 33, subsection 2. We are not told that section is being amended. The House should have been told that that section is being amended. The Section 48, which now appears in the bill, is not the same wording which appeared in the legislation of 1948. It is instances of this kind together with the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) conduct this afternoon, which makes it necessary for us to reserve judgment on this bill until it reaches committee and in that stage we will make it even more clear why the bill is not acceptable to us in its present form.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the innuendo by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe)—

MR. JOLLIFFE: No innuendo. It is a perfectly straight statement.

MR. BLACKWELL: Perfectly so. I feel that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) before putting such comments as that on the record, should have made some reference to the amendment he refers to, which he surrounded with an aura of iniquity. The fact is that at the opening of my remarks, I indicated that this was a consolidation of the provisions, and I was dealing with what might be regarded as important principles. I made no commitment that in the sections throughout the bill there was not some revision of language, and there might be some small principles affected.

I am sure no one in this House believes the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) would deal entirely with a bill without a comparison of the sections of the present statutes which are quite available, and I think the insinuation is really quite uncalled for, and that is all I care to say tonight.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is no insinuation. I made a very definite statement that there is a section here which appears to have no change in it, while in fact, it has been amended. That is misleading.

MR. BLACKWELL: You created the inference of some deep iniquity, which was not only not intended, but which did not take place.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I say it is highly improper.

MR. BLACKWELL: All mistakes are highly improper. You were doing better when you were trying to cheer up, and smile once in a while. I know it is a strain for you to make that effort—

MR. JOLLIFFE: You did better

when you placed the correct comments on the bills in the texts.

MR. BLACKWELL, We always try to do that. I do not take the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) as being infallible. That may be one of the distinctions between us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a certain amount of latitude permitted in the House tonight in relation to comments made by different hon. members on the bill, and I think perhaps it might be just as well that if the hon. member for St. Davids (Mr. Dennison) has refrained from making any reference to certain reports. It was only recently in this House that he took great umbrage to what the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) said, when he referred to him as a person who came through the back door seeking help, and then throwing rotten vegetation on the front porch.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I said that was exactly what the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) did to you.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is exactly what the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) said about him (Mr. Dennison). If the people of this community got any conception at any time that you had any relationship with the Communist Party, it was not from that report; it was from your own actions on the School Board.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I want to put the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) straight, if he will let me, on this point, and I want to say that my actions on the School Board, to which he is referring, I would like to explain to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no; speak on the bill. It is too late now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On a question of privilege.

MR. DENNISON: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, he brought the matter up, and I had to explain that when I had this little fracas with Mr. Sanderson—

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order; I suggest to you that this discussion is wholly irrelevant, and has nothing whatsoever to do with the principle of the bill.

MR. BLACKWELL: So was yours.

MR. MacLEOD: I was ruled out of order and conformed. That does not justify you in being out of order.

MR. DENNISON: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and a question of privilege is always in order.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) made reference to an action of mine on the Board of Education. When I sat on the Board of Education, the reference he is referring to is the reference where I objected, when there was a motion made to sing the National Anthem at all school meetings, and I said the board did not sing the National Anthem at their meetings, and until the board sang the National Anthem at all their meetings, they had no right to ask anybody else to sing it. So the motion passed, with my objection. The next day I made a motion in that Board of Education that the Board of Education sing the National Anthem, and the very members who attempted to "put me on a spot" voted against singing the National Anthem at their own meetings. If the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) thinks in some strange way that little by-play ranks me with the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) I do not see it at all. I would like to say that my little "rib" at the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) was quite in order, and it seems to me strange that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) should so suddenly take an interest in the reports on his desk when a little situation developed in this province where he had a secret policeman spying on members of the opposition, and said he did not know anything about it.

MR. BLACKWELL: I said nothing of the sort.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we had better get down to work. We have spent one hour and twenty-five minutes on this bill, and I assume the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is going to conclude this debate. I would suggest he present his argument, and then allow the hon. members to express their opinions according to true British tradition, by the vote.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In his usual concise manner, of course.

MR. BLACKWELL: It is nice to see the sun has come out, Mr. Speaker.

He was with one or two Communists, and I imagine a lot of people thought he was a fellow traveller.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I do not want the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to take offence at what I am going to say, because I am really a great friend of the hon. Attorney-General.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: I do not want to say anything in the House which would injure his leadership chances.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER: You could not.

MR. DENNISON: I have not my "Blackwell-for-leader" button tonight, but if I can get to the convention at which the leadership is discussed, I shall certainly vote for the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) because from our standpoint, he would be an ideal man to be the leader of the Tory Party.

MR. BLACKWELL: That would certainly give me the kiss of death.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, whether I may be strictly in order or not, I would like to say something in this House in relation to the loyalty of my cabinet colleagues and the support of the government supporters for the measures which I appear to have the responsibility of piloting through this House.

Quite contrary to what might have been inferred I would like to say that the modifications to be made to this bill were proposed by me to my colleagues of the executive council, and were acceptable to them, as policy, and they were supported by the government supporters in a re-caucus on the bill, and it merely exemplifies the willingness of this government to always consider points which require consideration, to our combined action, which exemplifies the team play which is always exhibited between the members of this government and our supporters in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: Now, there is one contribution to the debate, if one may call it such, by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) which is on the principle of the bill, and that is the question of union affiliations, and the accompanying comments he made about the use of Provincial Police. I cannot permit this debate, Mr. Speaker, to be closed without some reference to that statement which he made.

There was one part of it—and one part of it only—that had any relation to the facts, and that part, Mr. Speaker, was when he said that a great majority of those in the labour unions were loyal Canadians. With that I agree. But his statement that the use of police in labour disputes in this province was improper use, and intended to interfere with the collective-bargaining rights of the workers, who were, in a legitimate way, on strike. That statement, to his knowledge, and to the knowledge of every hon. member of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, is completely false. That is but part of the subversive type of propaganda with which the workers of this province are constantly being subjected by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and his colleagues in their particular political move.

I wish to take this opportunity of complimenting the hon. Leader of the

Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that in this session he has learned to smile once in a while.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is not the kiss of death?

MR. BLACKWELL: No.

MR. PORTER: It is not even a kiss.

MR. BLACKWELL: He recognizes that the people of this province will never accept as a government of this province any political party that is not ready to maintain the laws of the land. I appreciate, too, that he has refrained from the subversive type of discussion he referred to in the last election campaign, when he termed some of the officers of the Ontario Provincial Police as "Blackwell's Black Legs," and I think considering the personnel, and the legitimate welfare of the party, that it is not only in the public interest, but also in the interest of the party he leads in Ontario, that he discontinue talking what is nothing but pure nonsense.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I say, Mr. Speaker, for the enlightenment of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that there are several members of the force to whom the expression applies, and applies most appropriately. As to the great majority of the force, they are a very fine body of officers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is not what you said in the election.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): You did not say that after they captured you down near Belleville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BLACKWELL: I know this, Mr. Speaker, there was one member of the force who was the subject matter of an enquiry, which the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) saw fit to refer to—

MR. SALSBERG: I referred to him?

MR. BLACKWELL: I did not refer to you at all.

MR. SALSBERG: You mentioned my constituency.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am sorry, I meant the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). That was a member of the police force who was a great friend of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), who went to CCF meetings with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) following that enquiry, and who during the steel strike in Hamilton had hotel accommodations in that city, and was adequately supplied with funds, I do not know from whence, but what he was trying to do was to persuade the individual members of the Provincial Police not to do their duty.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is entirely mistaken in what he is saying. No doubt he was misinformed about it, but I have considerable knowledge of the incident to which he refers, and the statement he has just made about the man in question is entirely untrue.

MR. BLACKWELL: Well, it was gracious of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to say that no doubt I was misinformed—

MR. JOLLIFFE: You must have been.

MR. BLACKWELL: All I have as authority for that statement are statements of members of the police force whom he approached, and tried to bring down to his room at the hotel, and provide them with alcoholic and other refreshments.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That was just the gossip of your very inefficient snoopers.

MR. BLACKWELL: I thought I would just like to close the debate, Mr. Speaker, with this observation, and to compliment the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) on the fact that he has not seen fit in this debate to assume the type of discussion he did in the general election.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) will permit, I want to say this to him and to the hon. members of the House. He is under some serious misapprehension about the dispute to which he has just referred, and to the part which was played in that dispute by certain individuals. I was present in Hamilton on that occasion as legal counsel for the union concerned, and I was in touch not only with the union concerned, but with a great number of other people, including the police officers of the city of Hamilton, and the municipal authorities. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has seen fit to refer to a man who was no longer on the provincial police; he was an independent Ontario citizen, with the same rights as any other citizen. That citizen was asked to go to Hamilton for the purpose of counselling and advising with myself and other people, and I may say there was no secrecy about it whatsoever. With a view to discussing ways and means whereby bloodshed could be prevented in the City of Hamilton, and how the difficulties could be avoided. I may say the advice and counsel he gave us was of real assistance. I may say this also to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), although I think he may know of it, that the commanding officers of the police detachment which did eventually reach Hamilton, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the provincial police, surveyed the situation, and after consultation with the head of the Hamilton police force, made very wise decisions and did not take the action which some "hot heads" had urged them to take, which might have led to bloodshed, which the responsible people wished to avoid.

In order to be fair about the matter and so the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) will no longer be under a misapprehension, these things should be said to him and we all should understand very very clearly simply because a former member of the Force, a member of the Bar, and the mayor of Hamilton, and various other people put their heads together, it did not necessarily follow they were conspiring to subvert the Ontario Police Force; quite the opposite.

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: I have the police reports.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Your police reports have not always been as reliable as they should be.

The House divided.

Motion agreed to on division.

AYES: 47
NAYS: 15

HON. L. M. FROST (Treasurer): 67th Order.

THE COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 67th Order; second reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend The Companies Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. D. PORTER (Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Companies Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE (Leader of Opposition): Are we going to hear from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter)?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this bill consists of a revision of Part XII of the Companies Act. This part of the Companies Act was originally introduced into the legislation for the purpose of providing for the incorporation of co-operative associations. Originally, the Act was passed many years ago and has had no amendment of any importance for a great many years. In the course of time, there has been considerable experience with this form of incorporation and certain changes have been under consideration for some time.

The Ontario Co-operative Union is an organization which has 150 members consisting of various co-operatives throughout the province, and the revision now placed before the legislature in this bill has been very carefully worked out in conjunction with the officers of the Ontario Co-operative Union and is

satisfactory to that organization which is chiefly concerned with the carrying on of organizations of this kind.

I shall just indicate what the main changes consist of in this bill, that is, in relation to the former Part XII of the Act. It is provided in this bill that the capital of a co-operative shall consist of one class of shares only with a nominal or par value of $5 or any multiple of five, not exceeding $100. At present, a co-operative can have preference or common shares which may be either of par or no par value. The practice in co-operatives is generally to discourage preference and no par shares, as all shareholders are generally considered to be more or less on the same basis.

The new bill also prescribes that information which shall be contained on the share certificate that each share certificate will contain certain information whereby the purchaser of the share can readily ascertain the rights which attach to the shares.

In the second place, the next change that I would like to mention is that it will now be permitted for a corporate shareholder or member to appoint an officer or director to attend or vote on its behalf at meetings of shareholders or members. Under the present Act, a corporate shareholder or member cannot vote, as there is no voting by proxy. That is to correct that situation because as I understand it, in a number of cases, there are corporate shareholders of co-operatives. In the third place, it will be permitted for a director or officer or a corporate member or shareholder to become a director of the co-operative, if, of course, the members of the co-operative vote accordingly.

In the fourth place, under the present legislation the surplus funds of a co-operative are divided each year on the basis of the volume of business which the shareholders or members have done with or through the co-operative. The new section 150 provides some change in this; it provides for the distribution of the surplus on the basis of the quality, quantity or value of the goods or products acquired, marketed, handled, dealt in or sold, or services rendered by the co-operative. The section changes somewhat the manner of distribution of surplus funds to conform with the wording of the Income Tax Act.

The fifth, Section 151 of the bill, permits a co-operative (a) to require shareholders to invest patronage returns in shares of the company, and secondly, to require shareholders or members to lend patronage returns to the corporation. No shareholder or member is required to invest or lend patronage returns when the corporation is insolvent. This provision together with Section 152, partly gives effect to the revolving capital plan idea, which is particularly desired by the Ontario Co-operative Union.

Sixth, Section 152 permits the purchase of outstanding shares, first, where a shareholder consents—that is, the purchase of outstanding shares of a co-operative itself, first, where the shareholder consents; second, where a co-operate shareholder is being dissolved and, third, where a shareholder has not done business with the co-operative for one year. This provision differs from the general principle of company law, that a company cannot deal in its own shares. It is, however, considered essential by the Ontario Co-operative Union to keep the membership alive by purchasing shares of persons who are no longer interested in the co-operative. Section 152 (2) limits the amount of money which the co-operative may use to purchase shares and the number of shares to be purchased in each year. The price which the co-operative may pay for the shares is the par value or the book value, whichever is less.

Seventh, Section 153 (1) provides that loans from members and patronage returns shall rank after ordinary debts on a distribution of assets.

Eighth, at present, a co-operative upon dissolution must distribute its surplus assets in the case of (a) a co-operative with share capital on a share basis; and (b) a co-operative without share capital on a membership basis.

Under the new bill, by Section 153 (2), after payment of the debts—it is provided that after payment of debts, including dividends, if any, and the amount paid up on outstanding shares, the company may pass a by-law authorizing the distribution of the remaining assets (a) equally among members or shareholders, irrespective of the number of shares held; (b) among members or shareholders on the basis of patronage returns; or (c) for charities or for purposes beneficial to a community.

9. Section 154 authorizes by-laws particularly with respect to delegates and delegate voting.

10. In view of the wide scope which the proposed Part 12 gives to co-operatives to pass by-laws affecting the rights of shareholders, it is thought advisable under Section 155 to provide such by-laws passed pursuant to Part 12, shall not be effective until confirmed by a two-thirds vote of the shareholders present or represented at a meeting.

11. Section 157, has been included at the suggestion of the Ontario Co-operative Union, and it especially provides that a co-operative shall have power to engage in or assist in educational or advisory work relating to co-operation and co-operatives.

12. Section 158, (b) gives the Lieutenant-Governor in Council power to declare a corporation no longer a co-operative where 50 per cent. of the business is not transacted with members or shareholders. This is quite an important section.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is new, is it not?

MR. PORTER: That is new and I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will appreciate what the intention of that really is. It is to assure when a corporation does less than 50 per cent. of its own business with others than shareholders, it can be deprived of its privileges because it would not be considered a bona fide corporation.

That, I think, outlines generally what the proposed changes in this legislation amount to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, this is one of those happy occasions on which I can say that it seems to us this is a good piece of work and one we shall whole-heartedly support. I am not going to take time discussing the principle of the matter, I think what it adds up to is a consolidation and revision of Part XII. In the light of the changing conditions, the co-operative movement in this province has grown to great proportions and in the light also of the experience of the co-operative movement during recent years I am not going to say any more, except that I think the government is to be commended for sponsoring a revision of this kind.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 69th Order;

THE BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 69th Order; second reading of Bill No. 143, "An Act to amend the Boards of Education Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 143. "An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act."

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is going to say something on this?

MR. PORTER: This bill, as I said on first reading, makes some changes which are not of a very far reaching nature. The first part of the bill is re-enacted to include municipal boards created under section 2 (c). It explains the definition of "municipal board." It includes a board which is in a territorial district. Section 2 provides, under the present section of the Act as it now exists, that a municipality can establish a municipal Board of Education only after a resolution of council and a vote of the

electors. This means at least 15 months may elapse between the time council may decide it is expedient to have a Board of Education and the time it could start operation.

Section 3 provides, after Section 2 (c) being added to it, it provides for establishing a municipal board in a territorial district for two or more municipalities.

Section 2 (d) is added for the establishing of a high school district. Provision may be made for a Board of Education for a district.

Section 4 provides the right to have an elective membership on a Board of Education of a city elected by wards. This, at the present time, is limited to cities of 200,000 or over and the only city having this right at the present time, is the City of Toronto. This new section extends it to 100,000 or more and provision is made to allow the elected members of a municipal board to be elected from the beginning.

It is provided under Section 5, the amendment makes it clear that a copy of the resolution providing for a union board must be filed with the clerk.

Section 6 provides for a mileage allowance in municipalities of a high school district comprising two or more municipalities. It provides that they may pay.

MR. NIXON: There is nothing in this Act dealing with the situation that developed in Hamilton, where the Board is partly elected and partly appointed and they had a plebiscite and the people elected to have their board elected. That matter has come before the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), has it not?

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes. I think they will now be able to do as they want. What they wanted in Hamilton was a Board of Education elected by wards. If they want a Board of Education elected by wards they will have to put the question to the electors. The ratepayers at one time had a question put before them but it was not quite the same as that provided by the Act. There really was no authority to put that question and it was meaningless except it apparently showed that the people were in favour of something of this kind.

Now, we have extended this privilege of election by ward. That could be extended to the City of Hamilton, if they want to make use of it.

MR. G. T. GORDON (L, Brantford): Mr. Speaker, did I understand that the City of Toronto was the only city which elected a Board of Education by wards?

MR. PORTER: No, I said this Act now requires 200,000 of a population, but I believe there are several under private Acts.

MR. GORDON: I was going to say that the City of Brantford was doing this.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) used the words "municipal board," when he really means the Board of Education. It seems to me it would read better if we used the words Board of Education instead of municipal boards. In that case you would not have to have a definition.

MR. FROST: Would my friend (Mr. Dennison) allow that to come up in committee?

MR. PORTER: In the meantime I will explore that.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 70th Order.

COLLEGE OF ART ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 70th Order, second reading of Bill No. 144, "An Act to amend The College of Art Act." Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 144, "An Act to amend The College of Art Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 71st Order.

CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 71st Order; second reading of Bill No. 145, "An Act to amend The Continuation Schools Act." Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 145, "An Act to amend The Continuation Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 72nd Order.

HIGH SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 72nd Order; second reading of Bill No. 146, "An Act to amend The High Schools Act." Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 146, "An Act to amend The High Schools Act."

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Speaker, any new principles involved?

MR. PORTER: No. To a very large extent most of these changes are of a minor nature. I would not consider them as being any vital changes of principle.

MR. NIXON: It is a very long bill and I am not suggesting the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) should go over it clause by clause at this time.

MR. PORTER: I hardly think it is necessary. I might say that they are almost entirely routine, although I do not want my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) to face me with some omission later on.

MR. FROST: It could be discussed in committee.

MR. PORTER: I think perhaps the most important item here deals with the constitution of boards of high school districts and certain changes in the legislation in view of experience developed in that respect.

There is one section which deals with a contract between a board and a teacher—in some cases these contracts have been held to be no contract at all. Where there is no contract actually signed, just a verbal contract, this section provides that the terms of the standard teacher's contract will be held to apply.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) tell us if his deputy is in favour of the bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: That is a question I refuse to answer. I will take the whole responsibility myself.

MR. NIXON: Get advice by counsel.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 73rd Order.

THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 73rd Order, second reading of Bill No. 147, "An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act," Mr. Porter.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not want to be too technical about the matter, but the bills are not printed.

MR. FROST: Actually they were in the book when the session commenced, today.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, but they were not in my book today when I was examining the bills.

MR. FROST: Actually, I would say this bill is a routine matter.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not pressing any objection.

MR. DENNISON: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) say his deputy is in favour of this one too?

MR. PORTER: Oh, everyone.

I move second reading of Bill No. 147, "An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 74th Order.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 74th Order, second reading of Bill No. 148, "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) give us some explanation of this?

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is giving some explanation.

MR. PORTER: This bill deals with a routine matter, chiefly for the purpose of bringing into line certain practices under the Public Schools Act, with the practice of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

You have approved of all these, Mr. Minister?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Yes.

MR. PORTER: I do not think they need any further recommendation. It also provides for the 12 meetings a year in the case of the township area board, following the same principle as was in the previous Act, and requires the board to open a special bank account. Also it contains reference to teachers' contracts similar to provisions in the former Act, and I think those are the main provisions.

MR. TEMPLE: Not likely to upset the educational system?

MR. PORTER: No.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 75th Order.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 75th Order, second reading of Bill No. 149, "An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

MR. PORTER: I move second reading of Bill No. 149, "An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act." This bill is complementary to the Public Schools Act, the same sort of amendment, the same type of subject matter as The Public Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 76th Order.

THE TEACHERS' BOARDS OF REFERENCE ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 76th Order, second reading of Bill No. 150, "An Act to amend The Teachers' Boards of Reference Act, 1946," Mr. Porter.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker I move second reading of Bill No. 150, "An Act to amend The Teachers' Boards of Reference Act, 1946."

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) happens to be a member of my own profession and neither of us were school teachers, as far as I know. I would be interested to hear a word or two from him, about the principle of Section 1 of this bill, at least. It seems to me it is the important one, and it is rather an interesting point from a lawyer's point of view and probably from the teachers' point of view as well.

MR. PORTER: This bill is designed to remove a certain uncertainty which exists under the present Act as to whether a teacher's employment, which has been extended in consequence of the award of a Board of Reference, is automatically ended at the conclusion

of the period of extension mentioned. I think this arose as a result of some cases which came up and somebody questioned whether the teacher would be entitled to be reinstated exactly in the same position as he was before the Board of Reference or whether his term would automatically come to an end at the end of the period of extension, and under the terms of the proposed bill, there is no doubt left of the intention of the Minister's direction following the award of the board. The hon. members may know, the machinery under these Teachers' Board of Reference—a judge and the two other members of the board are appointed to decide the matter and then the Minister makes a direction as a result of that decision.

MR. NIXON: Is the Minister's direction always in accordance with the findings of the board, or have you the right to make a direction in opposition to it?

MR. PORTER: To tell you the truth, I don't know, but I will get that information just in a moment. I do not know what my powers are under this.

MR. NIXON: I could not just see how the explanatory note tied in with the section itself, in regard to the Minister's direction there.

MR. PORTER: Yes, the Minister may modify the decision under the existing legislation.

MR. JOLLIFFE: So far you have not done it.

MR. PORTER: No, I have not had a single instance yet.

MR. NIXON: Better hope you won't have it.

MR. PORTER: Under the terms of the proposed bill, there will be no doubt of the Minister's direction following the award of the board. There will be no longer any confusion as to the exact state.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I suppose the teachers' organization know of this change, do they? Or were they consulted? Or was it undertaken merely as a matter of ministerial policy?

MR. PORTER: The only teachers' organization that would be consulted in connection with legislation of this kind would be the Ontario Teachers' Federation, and they have been consulted.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 77th Order.

THE SCHOOL SITES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 77th Order; second reading of Bill No. 151, "An Act to amend The School Sites Act," Mr. Porter.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 151, "An Act to amend The School Sites Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. FROST: 78th Order.

THE CHANGE OF NAME ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 78th Order; second reading of Bill No. 152, "An Act to amend The Change of Name Act, 1948," Mr. Blackwell.

MR. FROST: In the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 152, "An Act to amend The Change of Name Act, 1948."

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, if the party opposite are not going to change their name again—you changed your name once before in the last five years.

MR. FROST: No, this bill is only that you may explain to the public what "CCF" means.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, this arises out of divorces.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 79th Order.

AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONSOLIDATION OF REGULATIONS FILED UNDER THE REGULATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 79th Order; second reading of Bill No. 153, "An Act to provide for the Consolidation of Regulations filed under the Regulation Act, 1944," Mr. Blackwell.

MR. FROST: In the absence of Mr. Blackwell I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 153, "An Act to Provide for the Consolidation of the Regulations filed under the Regulation Act, 1944."

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is a companion bill to the other?

MR. FROST: That is right.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 80th Order.

THE INSURANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 80th Order; second reading of Bill No. 154, "An Act to amend The Insurance Act," Mr. Blackwell.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 154, "An Act to amend The Insurance Act."

MR. DENNISON: May we have an explanation of this one?

MR. FROST: These bills are all a series of bills from number 78, and they are bills of a routine character, and they are really self-explanatory. Now, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is not here at the moment, but I may say in committee these items can be discussed. Actually speaking they are disconnected matters relating to these particular acts. I think the notes themselves are explanatory of the bills. In any event, if they are not, the matter can really be discussed better in committee than they can at this point. If that is satisfactory to my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison).

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just to indicate we are of a forgiving nature, we will not show our displeasure at the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) absence by forcing a division on this bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 81st Order.

THE COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 81st Order; second reading of Bill No. 155, "An Act to amend The Companies Act," Mr. Blackwell.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 155, "An Act to amend The Companies Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 82nd Order.

THE REGISTRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 82nd Order; second reading of Bill No. 156, "An Act to amend The Registry Act," Mr. Blackwell.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 156, "An Act to amend The Registry Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider certain resolutions and to consider certain bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

MR. FROST: I beg to inform the House that his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the consideration of the House.

Order No. 26.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 26, Resolution by Mr. Challies:

"Resolved,

That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may guarantee the repayment of advances made by banks, or any other indebtedness incurred by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission pursuant to subsection 3 of section 42 of The Power Commission Act as re-enacted by section 9 of Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 27. Mr. Porter.

"Resolved,

That,

(a) The Treasurer of Ontario shall issue Ontario Government debentures or stock which shall be a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(b) when the payments into the Teacher's Superannuation Fund in any year are insufficient to make the required payments out of the fund, the deficiency shall be made up out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and

(c) the Treasurer of Ontario shall place to the credit of the fund sums equal to two-thirds of the contributions of every person employed; and

(d) the Treasurer of Ontario shall pay interest on all sums placed to the credit of the fund during any fiscal year, as provided by Bill No. 132, The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 28. Mr. Blackwell.

"Resolved,

That every registrar paid by fees or other emoluments and not by salary shall be entitled to retain to his own use in each year his net income as defined in The Registry Act up to $3,500, as provided in subsection 1 of section 1 of Bill No. 156, An Act to amend The Registry Act."

Resolution agreed to.

MR. FROST: Order No. 60.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 60th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend The Marriage Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, with regard to this form which is referred to in Section 3, I think it is rather similar to the form which was in use under the recent Act during the past year, and which was so strongly objected to by many of the clergy. Their objections are apparently removed by the changes in this bill.

The only comment I have to make is that the idea of asking the clergy in the first place to fill out a statement with so much information on it, was entirely unsound. I realize that is now recognized with the result we have this bill and the changes, but it does seem to me that so far as vital statistics are concerned, statements, of the kind required in this form, which is not to be completed by the parties, should always be made by the people who have direct knowledge of the matter. It is a very unsound principle to ask somebody else, whether he is a clergyman, a doctor or what have you, to fill out information when only the people directly experiencing the statistics concerned can give the correct information.

Certainly I know it was unfair to ask members of the clergy to sign statements giving a lot of information which, as far as they were concerned, was pure hearsay.

I am glad the change is being made, but it was certainly a great mistake ever to bring it out in such a form in the first place.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC

Minister of Municipal Affairs): It was never the intention of the department that the clergy should fill out the form. They took it upon themselves to fill them out. It was just that the clergy should sign the form saying to the best of their knowledge it was correct. They were not supposed to fill in the form in the first place. However, in order to simplify the matter, we did away with the paper and put it on the marriage certificate, so that instead of the marriage certificate going to the divisional registrar it comes directly to our office from the clergyman.

Therefore there is only the marriage certificate to be filled out.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if at this time the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would like to give us some reason for inclusion of the question on racial origin in the form at all. I do not know how available these forms are to the general public or whether they can be examined or only obtained at the department, but would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) tell us what purpose the question establishing racial origin serves in this particular form?

MR. DUNBAR: This is for the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the most of this information which we get. 90 per cent. of it would be for the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

MR. PARK: I just wanted to know.

MR. DUNBAR: I have forms here from all the provinces, and there is only one province with fewer questions than we have. All the others are more. British Columbia has 33 questions instead of 28.

MR. PARK: Which is the lucky province?

MR. DUNBAR: That is five more than we had.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Of course, the form does not explain what is meant by the term "racial origin." The Dominion Bureau of Statistics may have a clear idea of what it is, but what will the registrars think it means? Will the Minister be prepared to explain what is meant by the term "racial origin"?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, that it is absolutely necessary.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But what does it mean?

MR. DUNBAR: Any statistics on origin; if a man was born in Ireland, as my hon. friend (Mr. Park) was, then he came from Ireland; if he was born in Scotland, then he came from Scotland; if he was born in Germany, then he came from Germany, or anything else. I cannot see anything wrong with that.

MR. PARK: To establish a case for the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar): I was born in Ireland of an Irish mother and a Scottish father. What do I put about racial origin?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): You are a Scotsman, sure.

MR. DUNBAR: It would not be difficult for you to write that down.

MR. JOLLIFFE: My point is this, Mr. Chairman, the term "racial origin" is a very ambiguous term, which may be interpreted and defined in a good many different ways. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics, no doubt, have their own ideas about what it means and the information they want, but I do not think the information they get is going to be worth a "hoot" unless it is understood by the registrars and the people who complete those forms. When they say "racial origin" as it appears on the form, what is wanted? Is it national origin that they really want, or is it colour they really want; is it racial origin as understood by the anthropologists, or as understood by the layman, because as understood by the layman it has no scientific meaning.

AN HON. MEMBER: Near enough.

MR. DUNBAR: How would you say it if you were filling that out? I

would not say because you were born in China you were a Chinaman at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: That is as good an explanation as I can give you about "racial origin."

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): But if you are born in Canada, you are at least a Canadian now.

MR. DUNBAR: I beg your pardon?

MR. NIXON: If you are born in Canada you are at least a Canadian now.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, really a Canadian, yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That comes under the heading "citizenship," but I should be glad if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) could tell me what information is required by the term "racial origin."

If you were, for instance, Irish, on the ground your parents came from Ireland, to say of a person they are of Irish origin is not to give their racial origin, that gives their national origin. I object to such unscientific terminology on a form of this kind.

MR. FROST: As long as the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is satisfied, let us not question it. We do not want to start another dominion-provincial argument.

MR. DUNBAR: That is taken up by all the provinces and they have agreed on the form. It is not a question of Ontario asking some questions not asked in another province.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I appreciate, if you are sinning, you are not sinning alone. I am not putting the blame on you alone, but I say if a term as loose as "racial origin" is used, then you should obtain a precise definition from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics of what they want, and send it out to all the registrars so they will be able to explain what it means when the parties complete the form.

MR. DUNBAR: We will tighten up on it.

MR. SALSBERG: I am very glad the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) raised this point. I do not think this department or this government is innovating anything, or introducing anything new, or that it is doing anything another province does not do. It is not a matter of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) or the government having to defend the schedule or not. What has been brought here is very important if we want a scientific approach and a scientific answer.

In some instances the term "race" is misunderstood, unless we accept a "Hitlerite" version of it, because in reply to that questionnaire, a person might say "Irish," or he might say "American" and that would not put him into a certain racial classification.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Or he might say "Anglo-Saxon."

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, he might say "Anglo-Saxon." That would not be a race. All that should be recognized is the common usage of the word, it is used loosely and without any meaning. People speak of Canada, for instance, having two races, English and French which is of course wrong. There is no scientific basis for that assumption.

You can speak of two nations. There are two nations in this country in my opinion the French and the Anglo-Saxon who are the majority on the other side, but you have no two races, because the French and the English are not people of separate or different races.

It would be very good if the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) would take this up with Ottawa and give a lead to the rest of the country in arriving at a scientific definition. If the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is to secure the national origin of a person making the application, then it should state: "What is your national origin?" if for purposes of statistics you want that information; otherwise, we are merely continuing what is in vogue, what is in practice, but what is scientifically wrong and neither provides in-

formation that is desired nor can any statistics based upon it be reliable.

MR. G. W. PARRY (PC Kent West): If you order Irish stew, you do not necessarily have to have an Irishman in the stew.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what we say.

MR. SALSBERG: No, but at least you have an idea of the stew you want.

MR. DUNBAR: I certainly can bring it to Mr. Marshall's attention in Ottawa, and give him your opinion regarding this, is that his questions are not properly asked, because they are all taken from them. We are just making out the forms for the dominion.

MR. L. F. K. FELL (CCF Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon Minister (Mr. Dunbar) if he could tell me to what extent the clergyman who solemnizes the marriage and signs this form is responsible for the correctness of the answers that are contained.

MR. DUNBAR: None whatever.

MR. FELL: None whatever?

MR. DUNBAR: No, not responsible at all.

MR. FELL: Then I would like to suggest there should be no need for the clergyman, sir, to have to sign a form, to sign his name under a form which has been filled out by someone else. Is your point then, sir, that they no longer have to sign that form?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, it is just that the marriage certificate shows they have been married by him, or the bans issued by him, but he does not sign the form, as we had it before, that to the best of his knowledge the form is correct.

MR. FELL: I see. I am sorry.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, may I at this point raise a question with the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar)? Some while ago I was approached by representatives of the Plymouth Brethren. That is a Christian religious group which desired special dispensation so as not to oblige them to marry before a minister of the church, as part of their religious belief. I remember mentioning it to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) privately and on another occasion mentioning it in the House. In doing that, I conveyed to the government the wishes of the group.

Hon. members might ask why the Plymouth Brethren thought of bringing the matter to me, and not to another hon. member, but I was approached by them and raised the question at the time, and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) implied that the matter was under consideration and that perhaps some such arrangement could be made.

The information given to me by the spokesman for the group in Toronto was that they find themselves obliged to travel to Manitoba in order to get married in accordance with their own belief, that in Ontario it cannot be done. Therefore, they go over to Manitoba or some of the American states where they can marry under what they call "civil marriages." Then they go through a religious ceremony in accordance with the belief of their group. That is the Plymouth Brethren.

Now, can the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) offer some enlightenment on that problem?

MR. DUNBAR: That was sometime ago you were speaking to me?

MR. SALSBERG: A couple of years ago.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, but I was Provincial Secretary then. The Marriage Act is under the Provincial Secretary, therefore, the hon. Mr. Porter would be looking after that. The Marriage Act is not under my jurisdiction now, it is the Provincial Secretary's department.

MR. SALSBERG: That is too bad. You were sympathetic.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, I was looking after them. A lot of them were getting married.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Does the Marriage Act come under the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) in his capacity of municipal affairs or reform institutions?

MR. DUNBAR: We do marry some of them there too.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Provincial Secretary): In view of the fact the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) was directing the question to my colleague, I was not listening. Nevertheless, I will look into it. I will look into anything. I will look into everything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Chairman, my colleague was wondering why the Plymouth Brethren came to him to get their problems solved.

MR. PORTER: They did not know their way around.

MR. MACLEOD: It occurred to me it may be a case of the Plymouth Rock turning to the Rhode Island Red.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sections 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule 4 (a) agreed to..

Bill No. 126 reported.

MR. FROST: Order No. 61.

THE TELEPHONE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 61st Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 127, "An Act to amend The Telephone Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 127 reported.

MR. FROST: 62nd Order.

QUIETING DOUBT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 62nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 128, "An Act to Quieting Doubts Affecting the Legal Status and Boundaries of Municipalities," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 9.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I think the short title could be improved on. I think that is a monstrous title. Surely if it is going to be a short title, we could at least do without brackets and names that do not fit. Cannot the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) do better than that?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Which?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am objecting to the short title of Section 9.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, no.

Section 9 agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I am objecting to it.

MR. FROST: Objection noted.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (PC Minister without portfolio): Objection overruled.

Bill No. 128 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 63rd Order.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT, 1948

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 63rd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 129, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1948," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 129 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 52nd Order.

THE ATHLETICS CONTROL ACT, 1947

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 52nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 116, "An Act to amend the Athletics Control Act, 1947," Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 6.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) a question on Section 6. Among the properties now turned over to His Majesty in the right of Ontario does that include the camping grounds up Orillia way?

MR. FROST: This deals with personal property. I assume that means equipment.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What happens to the real property?

MR. FROST: I do not think the commission owns the property; it is owned by the Crown in some other right.

MR. PARK: Who operates the land?

MR. FROST: It is operated by the Department of Education now, and has been for some years past.

Sections 6 to 8 included.

Bill No. 116 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 55th Order.

THE TILE DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 55th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act," Mr. Doucett.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 118 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 56th Order.

THE DITCHES AND WATERCOURSES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 56th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend the Ditches and Watercourses Act," Mr. Doucett.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 119 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 57th Order.

THE MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 57th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act," Mr. Doucett.

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 120 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 58th Order.

THE PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 58th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 121, "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act," Mr. Doucett.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 121 reported.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Are you trying to make the province dry, with all these Drainage Acts?

MR. FROST: We will put a drain up in High Park for you.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 59th Order.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 59th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act," Mr. Challies.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 4.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment Section 4. I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Temple, that subsection 7 of Section 4 of this Act be amended by the addition, after the word "Act" in the second line of the subsection the words:

"Or with the Annuities Branch of the Department of Labour, Canada,"

so that the first three lines of the said subsection 7 will read as follows:

"The Commission may enter into an agreement with one or more insurers licensed under the Insurance Act, or with the Annuities Branch of the Department of Labour, Canada."

I would like to say in support of that amendment that I hope the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) will accept it. I believe that any legislation passed by this Legislature, we should not say to the hydro that "You must only insure with a company licensed under the Insurance Act." I think we should give the Hydro Commission the right to either insure with a company licensed under the Insurance Act, or to insure, as many, many of our municipalities are insuring —and I understand the Toronto Hydro have found benefits, namely, with the Dominion Government Annuities Branch. I am informed that the Dominion Government annuities will provide the same insurance at a greatly reduced fee, to anything provided under the Insurance Act, and I am also informed that this will benefit the working men with the hydro, because the hydro will pay a share of this, and the working men will pay a share also. Why not give the hydro the opportunity of getting insurance at the lowest possible cost.

MR. FROST: I think we will let that matter stand, in order that we may look over the amendment which has been suggested, and see how it fits into the scheme of things. If we could pass on to the next sections, and hold this one up for the time being.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, before we let it stand for further consideration, there are two things I would like to point out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) and to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

In the first place, the purpose of the amendment by the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) is not to limit the field of choice which the commission itself may have. As the bill now stands, that choice is limited. I am not saying there is anything improper about it, but it appears that the Dominion Government annuity system has been overlooked, but now we have the assurance that it will be considered.

I am not saying there is anything improper about it. It appears the Dominion Government annuity system has been overlooked, but we have your assurance it will be considered.

The second point, as the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies) probably knows is that this is a very technical business, having a large organization, and to provide insurance benefits of any kind it is an extremely technical matter, and what is done nowadays is to obtain experts in that field to make analyses and to make recommendations as to the alternative schemes which are available. I would sound this note of warning, that some of the experts have an axe to grind, and some have not. I think here in Ontario there are experts available who can give unbiased advice. As the hon. vice-chairman (Mr. Challies) knows, different schemes have different advantages, and the different advantages have to be weighed against each other. I assume that will be done in the case of the Hydro Commission when it considers that part of the bill, and they will not be limited to the exclusion of the Dominion Government scheme.

MR. CHALLIES: The hon. member (Mr. Dennison) knows that the dominion annuity scheme is limited to $100 a month, which is pension and insurance. But, as the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has said, we will give it study, to see if it fits into the picture.

Section No. 4 stands.

On Section 5.

MR. CHALLIES: There is an amendment to subsection "cc" of Section 5. In the third line, add the words:

"Acquire by purchase or otherwise, water, coal, steam, oil or other supplies,"

so that the first part of the clause will read:

"cc: For the purpose of clause 'C,' shall acquire by purchase, lease, or otherwise hold, including real or personal property, and acquire by purchase or otherwise, water, coal, steam, oil or other supplies."

The idea is that the commission will purchase steam from existing companies which have an amount of boiler capacity in their plants, and we will instal steam generating equipment in order to get over an emergency. This will save the commission the necessity of installing steam plants for small units over the province. For example, in the dominion sugar plant at Chatham they have a very excellent steam plant, and the commission can enter into an agreement with them to supply steam from their boilers already existing, in order to meet the emergency for extra generation. There are plants at Thorold and Hamilton. We think it is desirable to instal about 80,000 horsepower in small units, which will save the commission a considerable amount of money. We would not have to pay for the installation of new boilers in the plant, so the extra words in this clause are necessary in order to give the commission the right to purchase steam, water, coal, oil and so forth.

Section 5 (as amended) to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 122 reported, with the exception of Section 4.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 54th Order.

CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 54th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1946." Mr. Welsh.

On Section 1.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a little problem there, and I am wondering whether some amendment cannot be made to clarify this. Perhaps this is an unusual situation we have there, but I think you will notice in Section 1/5 (b) where an authority has been established, and has under its jurisdiction part of a watershed, for instance, under the Grand River Conservation Commission, which was set up under the Grand River Conservation Act, they have authority in that watershed. A little later on the Grand River Authority was set up, along with some of the other authorities, under the same Act as the other authorities were, and in it they were supposed to be given the authority over whatever watershed was stated in it.

Now, who has the authority on this watershed? According to the Grand River Authority Act, it would be that body, but I believe that the dam that is being built there is being built under the Grand River Conservation Commission Act.

If anybody in that jurisdiction wants to get permission to alter some stream or outlet, to whom will they appeal? Could there in any way be something to clarify this, so that we would know to whom to go.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, I might say that the commission was set up long before the Conservation Authority came into being, and under the commission, there were certain projects which were laid down and approved both by the provincial and federal governments, and the Federal Government paid 37½ per cent. of those projects, and my only regret is we have not more of those commissions, so that we could collect the 37½ per cent. from the Federal Government. I can assure the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) that when these works which were authorized under the commission are completed, there will be no further authorizations for works under the commission As a matter of fact, most of the members of the present commission are members of the Grand River Authority.

MR. McEWING: Part of that is quite true. On the other hand, the money was not advanced under the Grand River Conservation Commission, until after the Grand River Conservation Authority was set up, as far as that point is concerned. This money has been advanced for that project after the Authority was set up.

The other point is, I believe those authorities which have been set up, such as the River Thames— have not these smaller authorities permission from the government that they will have the same appropriation, if they go ahead with the scheme? There is no definite rule laid down, but only the Grand River Commission is the one who will get that.

MR. WELSH: I would like to say to the hon. member (Mr. McEwing) that so far as the Grand River is concerned, that is the only one which has got it so far, and the Federal Government has not agreed in any cases since that time, to pay their share, so I think it is fair to assume they will not pay it.

MR. McEWING: Not to pay their share for which?

MR. WELSH: The 37½ per cent.

MR. McEWING: You mean this project, or on the River Thames?

MR. WELSH: They have agreed to pay for certain projects on the Grand River, and for nobody else.

MR. FROST: That is the Federal Government for you. Could you do anything with them?

MR. McEWING: Yes, maybe I can.

MR. MacLEOD: If you had signed an agreement with them, they would pay it.

MR. McEWING: This Act which has gone through has given the authority to the Grand River, but bodies do not know whom to approach.

MR. WELSH: The Grand River Authority is committed on one or two projects, and the Federal Government has agreed to pay their share.

MR. McEWING: Just a further question; under the authority that was set up, I believe there is not approval for other municipalities? Is that not right? Under the Authority that was set up, I believe there is a member for every municipality? Is that not right? Under the Commission there was just a member for the participating municipalities. Under the set-up now, it is just those who are contributing are represented; under the Grand River Authority, there is a representation for every municipality within the watershed.

MR. WELSH: That is considered, yes.

MR. McEWING: All right. These people who are on that Grand River Authority have been meeting to deal with this project, on which the 37½ per cent. is being dealt with. Have they the authority or not?

MR. WELSH: No, that is not quite right. These projects are dealt with under the old Grand River Commission. The authority for some other projects have the same people engaged in them, but they are on an entirely different basis.

MR. McEWING: I do not quite agree with it, from my knowledge gained from those who have attended the meetings. They come to me and say "Who has the authority; we are meeting to discuss these projects, and who has the authority?" and I have said "I will try to find out."

MR. JOLLIFFE: Better have an authority to determine who has the authority.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) that I believe this bill will give the two authorities the opportunity to join their forces, and may strengthen their hands, and may be a step in the right direction. I can see certain advantages in the Don Valley and the Humber Valley being brought together. But I do not think the bill will give these river valley authorities the power to clean up the river from pollution, and

make the authority effective, unless we give them a little more power. I noticed in the annual statement of the Humber Valley authority issued recently, that their receipts last year were only $950, and their expenditures only $422.89.

They had a balance of $527.11. Now, Mr. Minister, I am going to give you a suggestion. We have heard a great deal about the pollution of the Humber River and the Don River.

HON. D. PORTER (Minister of Education): Are you going to do something with the sludge up there?

MR. DENNISON: I beg your pardon?

MR. PORTER: Are you going to do something with the sludge this time?

MR. DENNISON: This deals with sludge.

MR. PORTER: I thought so.

MR. DENNISON: And some additional matters.

AN HON. MEMBER: Full of his subject.

MR. DENNISON: You cannot have sewage without first removing water from somewhere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: That is a statement of fact. You must have water before you can have sewage.

MR. PORTER: Well, that is the most profound remark we have had yet.

MR. DENNISON: I suggest the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) give these valley authorities the right to—

AN HON. MEMBER: More water.

MR. DENNISON: The right to operate water systems of the municipalities in which they live, and at the same time, run and operate the sewage systems. In other words, give the valley authorities the power to make the person who uses the water pay enough money for the water to replace that water back in the river again, pure and clear, free from sewage and free from sludge. I would like to point out, if the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) in this House enforced Section No. 98 of The Public Health Act, we would never have allowed any of these cities or towns in this province to pour untreated sewage into any of our rivers. In other words, we have been permitting people to break the laws of this province without punishment, and I think we must start now if we seriously intend to make these river valley authorities mean anything. We have to start and give them power to sell the water from the river valley or from that district and charge people enough for that water that the water can be put back into the river, pure and clear again.

I notice the Humber Valley Authority has been having some difficulties in the upper reaches of the valley. They are even finding that the trout which fishermen put in the special pools up there for the wealthy fishermen who have control of those—

MR. A. MACKENZIE (PC York North): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Member (Mr. Dennison) if I may make a statement?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE: Those fish were not put in the Humber River for wealthy people, they were put there for the benefit of all.

MR. DENNISON: I am glad to hear that they are for the benefit of all.

MR. PORTER: Why not go out there?

MR. MACKENZIE: That is right.

MR. DENNISON: I am very glad to hear the hon. Member for North York (Mr. MacKenzie) say that. The Humber Valley authorities are having some difficulty now because even the run-off from farm lands that are fertilized with certain fertilizers from those farm lands destroy the trout in the streams in that area.

The whole problem resolves itself, I think, into a matter of giving your river

valley authorities real authority, and I do suggest—you will have to talk it over with the muncipalities concerned, I think you will have to greatly enlarge their scope before they are going to mean anything in really making the Don Valley and the Humber Valley the beautiful river valleys we hope to see them in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS, Hear, hear.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): Just on the point of no authority being given, at least no funds being advanced as far as the Federal Government is concerned on any other project: has not the River Thames Authority purchased land and paid money for it, and if so, where did they get the money? I understand they have purchased certain lands in the Thames River Valley and paid money for it. Now, where did they get the money for it, if no government has advanced them any money?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): It must have been "Moscow Gold."

HON. L. M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): There is an election coming on.

MR. MacLEOD: Cannot you answer the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) does not know.

HON. G. ARTHUR WELSH (PC Minister of Planning and Development): No option has been entered into to purchase any lands, but as far as the Ontario Government is concerned, to the best of my knowledge I believe there has no advance been made, and I know definitely the Federal Government has made no advances. However, we are prepared to make those advances when they have conformed with certain regulations that are laid down.

MR. McEWING: Where did they get the money? I understand they had so much money. One of the members told me they spent all the money they have got, and he gave me an idea of what they have. He said: "We have an option on more land when we get some more money." They have spent some money.

MR. FROST: They collect money from their municipality.

MR. WELSH: The municipalities contributed 25 per cent., and we are quite prepared to contribute our share of it.

MR. McEWING: Then they must be working on the basis of the same proportion as was set aside on these other schemes?

MR. WELSH: Unfortunately, they are not. I wish that were so.

MR. MacLEOD: We are still in doubt.

Sections 1 to 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 123 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): I would like to finish this one bill if I may. Order No. 53.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 53; House in Committee on Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend the Children's Protection Act," Mr. Goodfellow.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 111 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions, and also that it reports certain bills with and without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report it has come to certain resolutions, and reports certain bills with amendments and certain bills without amend-

ments, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) tell us what his plans are for tomorrow? In making that request, I repeat the request made last week that if at all possible he indicate the departmental Estimates he proposes to take up, if we are going into Committee of Supply.

It seems to me it should be possible to tell us two or three of them, in any event, so as to exclude some others. This is a matter of importance to us as well as to the hon. Ministers concerned who present their estimates. It has something to do with preparation and study.

MR. FROST: Well, tomorrow we will go ahead with bills which are on the order paper and Estimates of the following departments: Treasury, Mines, Highways, Municipal Affairs, Attorney-General, and Education.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All those?

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): "All this and heaven, too."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Evening Session?

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, will there be a night session tomorrow?

MR. FROST: Yes, a night session tomorrow.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Provincial Secretary): You cannot do all that in an afternoon.

MR. FROST: Is that all right?

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.16 of the clock p.m.

Vol. III, No. 29

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

Motion to Adopt. Sixth and Final Report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, Mr. Cathcart, agreed to 1137

Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, third reading 1137

Mining Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, third reading 1137

Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway, bill respecting, Mr. Griesinger, third reading 1138

Homes for the Aged Act, introduced by Mr. Goodfellow, third reading 1138

Marriage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, third reading 1138

The Telephone Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, third reading 1138

Quieting Doubts, introduced by Mr. Dunbar, third reading 1138

Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, third reading 1139

Athletics Control Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, third reading 1139

Tile Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, third reading 1139

Ditches and Watercourses Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, third reading 1139

Municipal Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, third reading 1139

The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, third reading 1140

Children's Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, third reading 1140

Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welsh, third reading 1140

Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1140

Forest Management Act, bill to amend, Mr. Scott (Peterborough), bill reported 1140

Forest Fires Prevention Act, bill to amend, Mr. Scott (Peterborough), bill reported 1140

Teachers' Superannuation Act, introduced by Mr. Porter, bill reported 1141

Power Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Challies, bill reported 1144

Companies' Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1145

Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1145

College of Art Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1145

Continuation Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1145

High Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1145

Public Libraries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1145

Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1146

Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1146

Change of Name Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, bill reported 1146

Consolidation of Regulations, bill to provide, Mr. Blackwell, bill reported 1146

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, bill reported 1146

The Companies' Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, bill reported 1146

The Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, bill reported 1146

Teachers Board of Reference Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1146

The School Sites Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, bill reported 1147

City of Peterborough Act, bill respecting, Mr. Stewart, bill reported 1147

Cornwall Street Railway, Light and Power Co., bill respecting, Mr. McDonald, bill reported 1147

Village of Wasaga Beach Act, bill to incorporate, Mr. Johnston (Simcoe, Centre), bill reported 1147

Canada Comforter Company Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, bill reported 1147

The City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Patrick, bill reported 1147

Township of Etobicoke, bill respecting, Mr. Millard, bill reported 1147

Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association, bill respecting, Mr. Cathcart, bill reported 1147

Canadian National Exhibition Association, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, bill reported 1148

Township of Kingston, bill respecting, Mr. Pringle, bill reported 1148

Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1148

Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1170

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 1949.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I see hon. members have photographic likenesses of themselves—I hope they are likenesses, at any rate—on their desks today. In order to facilitate matters for hon. members, I have arranged to see that the photographs are returned to the photographer through our office.

Will you be good enough to mark the desired photograph, and through the page boy, return the proofs to the Speaker's office at your very earliest convenience.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting report by committees.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (PC Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the sixth and final report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Cathcart, from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, presents the following as its sixth and final report:

The committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Township of East York."

Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the City of Owen Sound."

Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines."

The committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 2.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 2nd Order; third reading of Bill No. 115, "An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act, 1939." Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 115, "An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act, 1939."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 3rd Order.

MINING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 3rd Order; third reading of Bill No. 86, "An Act to amend The Mining Act." Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 86, "An Act to amend The Mining Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 4th Order.

SANDWICH, WINDSOR AND AMHERSTBURG RAILWAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 4th Order; third reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting The Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway." Mr. Griesinger.

HON. G. ARTHUR WELSH (PC Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of hon. Mr. Griesinger, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting The Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 5th Order.

HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 5th Order; third reading of Bill No. 110, "The Homes for the Aged Act, 1949." Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Mr. Goodfellow, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 110, "The Homes for the Aged Act, 1949."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

THE SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 6th Order.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 6th Order; third reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend The Marriage Act." Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend The Marriage Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be initituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 7th Order.

THE TELEPHONE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th Order; third reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to amend The Telephone Act." Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to amend The Telephone Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 8th Order.

QUIETING DOUBTS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th Order; third reading of Bill No. 128, "An Act for Quieting Doubts affecting the Legal Status and Boundaries of Municipalities." Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 128, "An Act for Quieting Doubts affecting the Legal Status and Boundaries of Municipalities."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 9th Order.

VITAL STATISTICS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 9th Order; third reading of Bill No. 129, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1948." Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 129, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, 1948."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 10th Order.

ATHLETICS CONTROL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order; third reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to amend The Athletics Control Act, 1947." Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to amend The Athletics Control Act, 1947."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 11th Order.

TILE DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 11th Order; third reading of Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act." Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 118, "An Act to amend The Tile Drainage Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 12th Order.

DITCHES AND WATERCOURSES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 12th Order; third reading of Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend The Ditches and Watercourses Act." Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend The Ditches and Watercourses Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 13th Order.

MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 13th Order; third reading of Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act." Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 14th Order.

THE PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 14th Order; third reading of Bill No. 121, "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act." Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 121, "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 15th Order.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 15th Order; third reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend The Children's Protection Act." Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. G. ARTHUR WELSH (PC Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Mr. Goodfellow, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend The Children's Protection Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 16th Order.

CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 16th Order; third reading of Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1946." Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. ARTHUR WELSH (PC Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1946."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 19th Order.

FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 19th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 134, "An Act to amend The Forest Management Act, 1947." Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 134 reported.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): 20th Order.

FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 20th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 136, "An Act to amend The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1948." Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 136 reported.

MR. BLACKWELL: 22nd Order.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 22nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 132, "The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949." Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 10.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Is there any particular reason, Mr. Chairman, why the fiscal year is different from the fiscal year of the province?

MR. PORTER: It is just a matter of convenience. The Commission apparently requested that. I do not think it really matters very much as to whether it is quite in line with the provincial fiscal year or not. It carries on independent operations, and of course—

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not in line with the effective date of this bill either, nor with the beginning of the new system under this bill. I cannot see it is in line with anything. I assume there is a reason for it, but—

MR. PORTER: That is what they wanted. The Commission is the body which will have to carry it out.

Sections 10 to 23 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 24.

MR. D. BAXTER (L Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, in Subsection 2 of Section 24, "the amount of such allowance shall be computed by dividing the amount of his average salary for the last 15 years"; I might say I have had considerable communications from all teaching bodies in my constituency, who are very much in favour of most of this bill, and I myself feel it goes a long way towards meeting the demand at the present time. However, going back 15 years from now puts the teachers who are retiring in the next year or so back to the depression years when, in a good many cases, the School Board cut their salary by 10 per cent., and then when salary restoration was made, it was made on 10 per cent. of what was left after the 10 per cent. was deducted. In other words, they only returned possibly 9 per cent.

I am wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) could tell us how they came to arrive at the figure "15"?

MR. PORTER: The figure of 15 years was arrived at as a result of negotiations with the Ontario Teachers' Federation. It was apparently entirely satisfactory to them. As a matter of fact, there are two sides to the question. There is always the possibility that perhaps some time in the future when there might be another time when salaries will be reduced by some School Board, there might be some advantage in going back 15 years. At least, that is the way they looked at it, and it is such a vast improvement over the present Act, which is based upon the whole period of teaching, where by far the majority of years that are taken as the basis of the computation are years of much lower salaries.

I think it was decided this is about as far as we should go at the present time, and that it would meet with the general feeling, as far as we could ascertain what it was, of the representatives of the teaching profession.

Section 24 agreed to.

On Section 25.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to Section 25, Subsection 2, by adding the following words:

> "But no such allowance shall be less than $600.00 or more than $3,000.00."

That is being added merely as an "abundant caution," as the lawyers say, on the advice of the law officers of the Crown. It makes no difference in the principle of the bill.

Section 25 (as amended) agreed to.

On Section 26.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to Section 26, Subsection 2, by adding at the end of Subsection 2, the following words:

> "Or more than $3,000.00."

Section 26 (as amended) agreed to.

On Section 27.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to Section 27, Subsection 2, by adding the following words:

"Or more than $3,000.00."

Section 27 (as amended) agreed to.

On Section 28.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to Section 28, Subsection 2, by adding at the end thereof the following words:

"But no such allowance shall be less than $600.00 or more than $3,000.00."

Section 28 (as amended) agreed to.

On Section 29.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to Section 29, by deleting the words "per annum," at the end of Subsection 2, and adding the words:

"Or more than $3,000."

Section 29 (as amended) and Section 30 agreed to.

On Section 31.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow Section 31 to go through without speaking again, as I did yesterday. I think it very unfair for women teachers who are 70 per cent. of the teaching profession of the province, that there is no provision made for the women teachers who in very many cases support entirely one parent. This parent is usually the mother because the life expectancy is longer in the case of women. I cannot see why that provision was not put in. It is only just because the number of men who have made provision for their wives is greatly in excess of the number of women who will provide for their husbands, totally incapacitated husbands. There will not be many of them, however, there will be many cases of dependent mothers and I think the bill should have had that provision. In the profession, as it is, women are paying for superannuating men's widows, whereas a woman teacher who happens to die before her parent, the parent is thrown out on cold charity. I do not think that should be.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the hon. member (Miss Macphail) raises along with it a number of considerations. I think the hon. member (Miss Macphail) will probably agree that men teachers, in very many cases, also have parents to support as well as wives and children. Therefore, I do not think it would be quite equitable to attempt to adjust this matter in that way. I might say that the matter of dependents, other than wives and children, is now under investigation. It may take some time to find out just what any such inclusion would involve and if it is found that it could be satisfactorily worked out, perhaps on some future occasion an amendment could be made. However, we are not ready to do that now.

I would like to say something about the whole clause dealing with the relation between the women's share and the men's share in this fund. Besides, as the hon. member (Miss Macphail) has informed us, there is considerable feeling, particularly in some quarters, that as a result of the dependents clause in this bill the men teachers are going to get a larger share in view of their contributions. There are other factors involved in this and according to the figures we have of the past, regarding the disposition of contributions to this fund, it would appear that the women are getting by far the larger "take" out of this fund.

MISS MACPHAIL: Does that not all go to show the women are not getting salaries equal to the men's salaries?

MR. PORTER: How could that be?

MISS MACPHAIL: How would the men be putting in more if they were not getting more?

MR. PORTER: Oh, no, no. The men put in more and that is balanced by tak-

ing out more. But I say the net position is in favour of the women teachers at the present time. I would just say in the 3 year period ending in October, 1945, we have here a record of the aggregate contributions made of salaries by men teachers $2,380,000.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): What is that again?

MR. PORTER: The pension paid to men teachers during that period was $1,200,000, which is about 50 per cent. of what they actually contributed during that period. That is a fair indication of the position we are in now. Women teachers in the same period—of course there are a great many more women teachers—they contributed $4,900,000, and received in pension $2,950,000, or 60 per cent. of what they put in.

The same situation is found if you go back the 3 years prior to that. The men took out of the fund during that time, 57 per cent. of what they actually put in and the women took out 78 per cent. of what they had actually put in. The same is found in the period prior to that, the 3 year period, ending 31st of October, 1939. During that period, it was 58 per cent. for the men and 78 per cent. for the women and so on.

The reason for that is apparently the women generally retire 2 or 3 years earlier than the men. It is quite common for women to retire at 62, and men at 65. That is more or less the average age of retirement.

MISS MACPHAIL: Are they not going to retire at 62, now?

MR. PORTER: It depends on what the local school boards decide.

MISS MACPHAIL: But does not the bill say—

MR. PORTER: My recollection is, that under the old Act, male teachers did not get pensions unless they retired at 65. Now, a man gets the pension if he retires at 62. That, of course, does not say he retires at 62 but, in the past, it has been earlier for women and they have had 2 or 3 years additional pension. The hon. member (Miss Macphail) said herself that women outlive men on the average and they have several years additional pension. The actual result of that is if the men and women have contributed the same percentage of salaries, nevertheless, relatively men have actually taken out a little less than the women.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Under the old Act?

MR. PORTER: Under the old Act but it will be roughly the same under this bill. I would expect, because I do not think there is anything different in principle unless the men, as a whole, begin to retire earlier than they used to. If that happens, it may make some difference but, on the other hand, pensions for dependents are 50 per cent. of the whole and it is not contemplated that will upset the balance very much. Of course, there will be a commission to review this condition again and again, as in the past to see how this works out. If it is found there is any need for adjustment that will have to be made under the new Act, and no doubt it will be made.

I would like to say again that the whole question of dependents is still under consideration and if it is found to be reasonable for them to be included, after we have had some experience with this Act, it will be considered.

Section 31 agreed to.

On Section 32.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, may I just point out also under Section 32, in connection with what the hon. member (Miss Macphail) brought up. This may not reach complete satisfaction but at any rate there is provision here whereby a person who made a contract in writing, signed by him and deposited with the commission at least two years before he retires permitting the allowance he is entitled to, to be paid as an annuity to him upon his retirement during his lifetime and after his death, at one-half of the rate to the dependent named in such papers that would include any dependent, not only a wife and child, and it is a provision whereby an

annuity could be paid. I do not think that section has been used very much but it was in the old Act and seldom used but nevertheless it could be.

Sections 32 to 42, inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 43.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, on Section 43, who is going to be the authority to define when a person is incapable of looking after his own affairs?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, the Act says, "where the commission is satisfied." Of course, our practice has been that the commission has called in the advice of expert medical men to satisfy the commission in cases of this kind. That has been the practice, I think, ever since this fund was established.

Sections 43 to 61, inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 62.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to Section 62, Subsection 1, by adding after the words, "April, 1949," the following words: "Shall be paid without regard to any maximum specified in the said Act and . . ."

Section 62 agreed to.

On Section 63.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to Section 63, Subsection 2, to the effect that the following words be inserted after the words "to be employed," "without regard to any maximum then applicable."

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I might ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) how much difference there would be in the superannuation to a person who retired under the old Act and under the new Act just at this stage?

MR. PORTER: Of course, that depends on a good many factors but with these amendments it is going to relieve the situation a great deal in some cases. We have changed the $1,500 ceiling that has applied for a good many years. We found we have had teachers who had been principals in high schools for many years at quite large salaries, and having contributed very heavily to the fund and by reason of this ceiling if they applied they would get no more than $1,500, although if there had been no ceiling they would have around $2,000, sometimes a little more. This will relieve these cases and I think hon. members will agree that will be acceptable.

Section 63 (as amended) agreed to; sections 64 to 66, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 143 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 17th Order.

POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 17th Order; House in Committee on Section 4 of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act," Mr. Challies.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (PC Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Chairman, this provision of the Act dealing with insurance has nothing to do with the pension scheme and insurance plans of employees. It deals only with insurance. It gives the Commission authority to contract with insurance companies for coverage for its employees. It cannot buy insurance from the Dominion Annuities Branch, therefore, the amendment as read, would be completely co-operative.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Chairman, this is another case where the Hydro itself buys insurance on the employees and collects.

MR. CHALLIES: It is that part of the insurance scheme where employees —we have already had a pension comparable to an annuity and we are adding insurance to that. This gives the Commission the right to buy insurance from insurance companies and, as I have said, the Federal Annuities Branch does not sell insurance.

Section 4 agreed to.

Section 4 of Bill No. 122 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 24th Order.

COMPANIES' ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 24th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend The Companies' Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 125 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 25th Order.

BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 25th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 143, "An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 4.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, on Section 4, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would give us any information regarding the plebiscite taken before the passing of this bill. Would it have the same effect as a plebiscite taken after?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I am in a position to say what the legal effect would be, but my information is that the plebiscite as taken was not a plebiscite within the meaning of the Act. The question was not in the right form and there was no provision for a plebiscite under the Act under those circumstances. It certainly, in a rough and ready way, showed that the ratepayers were in favour of certain changes and, therefore, it was considered advisable to allow this amendment to the Act to be put forward. This will enable the city authorities to act, if they wish to do so. However, they will have to have another vote, I would think.

We have no proper way of attempting to retroactively legalize a vote which was not quite in accordance with the Act. We think it would be much better to let them have their vote under the Act, but we have given effect to what the apparent desire was, by permitting them to elect their Boards of Education by wards, if they wish to do so.

Sections 4 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 143 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 26th Order.

COLLEGE OF ART ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 26th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 144, "An Act to amend the College of Art Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 144 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 27th Order.

CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 27th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 145, "An Act to amend the Continuation Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 145 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 28th Order.

HIGH SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 28th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 146, "An Act to amend The High Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 19 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 146 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 29th Order.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 29th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 147, "An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 147 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 30th Order.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 30th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 148, "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 148 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 31st Order.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 31st Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 149, "An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 149 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): We will go over for the moment to the next page, and take the 34th Order, and come back to the others later.

CHANGE OF NAME ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 34th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 152, "An Act to amend The Change of Name Act, 1948," Mr. Blackwell.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 152 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 35th Order.

CONSOLIDATION OF REGULATIONS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 35th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 153, "An Act to provide for the Consolidation of the Regulations Filed under the Regulations Act, 1944," Mr. Blackwell.

Sections 1 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 153 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 36th Order.

INSURANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 154, "An Act to amend The Insurance Act," Mr. Blackwell.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 154 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 37th Order.

THE COMPANIES' ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 37th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 155, "An Act to amend The Companies' Act," Mr. Blackwell.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 55 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 38th Order.

THE REGISTRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 38th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 156, "An Act to amend The Registry Act," Mr. Blackwell.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 156 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 32nd Order.

TEACHERS BOARD OF REFERENCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 32nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 150, "An Act to amend The Teachers Board of Reference Act, 1946," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 150 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 33.

THE SCHOOL SITES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 33rd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 151, "An Act to amend the School Sites Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 151 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 72.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 72nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough," Mr. Stewart.

Sections 1 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 16 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 73.

CORNWALL STREET RAILWAY LIGHT AND POWER CO.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 73rd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the Cornwall Street Railway, Light and Power Co. Ltd.," Mr. McDonald.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A, B and C agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 18 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 74.

VILLAGE OF WASAGA BEACH ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 74th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 19, "An Act to incorporate the Village of Wasaga Beach," Mr. Johnston (Simcoe, Centre).

Sections 1 to 11 agreed to.

Schedule A agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 19 reported.

MR. FROST: 75th Order.

CANADA COMFORTER COMPANY LIMITED

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 75th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting Canada Comforter Company Limited," Mr. Rea.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 34 reported.

MR. FROST: 76th Order.

THE CITY OF LONDON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 76th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the City of London," Mr. Patrick.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 11 reported.

MR. FROST: 77th Order.

TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 77th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 17, "An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke," Mr. Millard.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 17 reported.

MR. FROST: 78th Order.

SARNIA YOUNG MEN'S AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 78th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting Sarnia

Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association," Mr. Cathcart.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 22 reported.

MR. FROST: 79th Order.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 79th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association," Mr. Rea.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 24 reported.

MR. FROST: 80th Order.

TOWNSHIP OF KINGSTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 80th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the Township of Kingston," Mr. Pringle.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 21 reported.

MR. FROST: 81st Order.

TOWN OF TECUMSEH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 81st Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 27, "An Act respecting the Town of Tecumseh," Mr. Murdoch.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 27 reported.

MR. FROST: 82nd Order.

THE CITY OF OTTAWA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 82nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa," Mr. Chartrand.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedules A and B agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 31 reported.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain bills, several without amendment, and one bill with amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole begs to report certain bills without amendment and one bill with amendment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): I am not in favour of the motion at the moment. I want to move an amendment, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that all the words in the motion after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

> "This House do now deal with the provisions of Bill No. 135, 'An Act to amend The Executive Council Act'."

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I felt that we probably would not reach the Committee of Supply until this evening, but we have gone ahead very rapidly, and at the moment, I am limited in connection with the Estimates. I have some Estimates that I would place before the House which do not deal with the matter my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) referred to. I have a few Estimates here, none of them dealing with the matter of the Ministers' salary. I have the Department of Public Works, and the Department of Provincial Auditor, neither of which deals with the particular matter my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) refers to. I am quite prepared to let that matter stand until the question of Ministers' salary arises.

MR. OLIVER: I think we can meet my hon. friend's (Mr. Frost) suggestion. The only reason for putting it at this time was that we are going through the Estimates.

I felt if we were going to be in opposition to that figure, we should do it on the first Estimate before the House. I am quite agreeable at the moment to fall in with my hon. friend's (Mr. Frost) suggestion on the understanding that this matter remain in abeyance only until we reach a department wherein it can be properly advanced.

MR. FROST: That is all right.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment then, is withdrawn by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver)? Is the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) satisfied to have the amendment withdrawn for the time being?

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Let it stand.

MR. OLIVER: Could not the amendment stand? Does it have to be withdrawn?

MR. FROST: You can always move it again.

MR. NIXON: An amendment, once withdrawn, under the rules, I do not think could be again advanced at the same Session. We do not want to get into a position where any one person can throw us out.

MR. OLIVER: The position as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is that if we agree, to withdraw this amendment at the moment, then its introduction will depend upon an unanimous vote in the House. If any hon. member objects to the re-introduction of this amendment, then, under the rules, it is quite clear the amendment cannot be re-introduced.

That is the position we are in at the moment, and I cannot see any other course but for the amendment to be proceeded with.

This may be left to the unanimous consent of the House. It may be considered that the amendment has not been put to the House at this particular time; therefore, the amendment will stand for the time being.

MR. OLIVER: That is satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: Does that meet with the consent of the House?

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): I would like to say something. If you are going ahead with that, I intend to move as an amendment that we go back, in regard to salaries to '29, then the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) would receive $1,500 and $1,000 for expenses. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), as Leader of the Opposition last year, sat in this House and on a committee—

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Out of order.

MR. OLIVER: If my hon. friend (Mr. Dunbar) is going to initiate this debate, Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to proceed. I thought it was the understanding we were going to let it remain in abeyance at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: That is the understanding.

MR. DUNBAR: Then there will be plenty of debate for you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hard stuff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The motion, therefore, is that I do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of Supply: Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

MR. DUNBAR: You are going back to the farm after you are defeated.

MR. OLIVER: I can go back there any time. That is more than you can.

MR. MacLEOD: Where would you go back to? Back to the business college, George (Mr. Dunbar)?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Page No. 77, the Department of Municipal Affairs. Vote 123.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, in order to start this "ball rolling" now—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: —which I know it will be, and which is welcome at all times, and before asking the hon. members to consider the Estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs, I would like to speak briefly upon the department's activities.

I might say this department is entirely different from most other departments—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): So is the Minister.

MR. DUNBAR: —because, unlike most departments of government, the Department of Municipal Affairs is not charged with carrying on or operating any provincial undertaking. Previous to 1943 the department devoted practically all its attention to the task of straightening out the financial affairs of approximately 42 municipalities which, during depression years, had been unable to meet their obligations as they fell due, or were in a precarious current financial position.

During the past 5 years the policy in all phases of the department's activities has been one of assistance wherever requested, not interference with the autonomy of local municipal authorities.

The department has gradually extended its services so that for members of municipal councils and other local boards and authorities, and for all their officials, the department may become the central advisory body upon every phase of municipal affairs. Consultation and advice is available by interview, telephonic and telegraphic communication and correspondence.

In addition, officers of the department make periodic visits throughout the province so that direct contact is made with municipal councils and officials. During the past two years the department has also held courses of lectures as key points in the province, and to these members of councils and officials are invited. The lectures are given by officers of the department on subjects such as general administration, election proceedings, municipal powers, budgeting, assessment, taxation procedure, accounting and auditing.

The department has made definite progress in effecting improvements in the municipal accounting practices. In order to give ratepayers a correct picture of the financial position of the municipality, and in order to permit a ready comparison of the financial activities of one municipality and another, and a comparison between one year and previous years in a municipality, the department has designed standard forms on which municipal auditors must submit their annual reports to the council and this department.

The headings on these statements conform to the recommendations made at an Inter-provincial Conference on Municipal Statistics. These new audit report statements relieve the municipal treasurers of the necessity of filing the extensive treasurer's return previously required. While the department insists all auditors use the forms prescribed by the department, a municipal council may instruct the auditor to file additional information in any form they desire.

We realize that the assessment in a municipality is the foundation upon which taxation for the costs of local government is based. If these costs are to be distributed equitably, we must have an assessment which is equitable not only as between properties within the local municipality, but also as be-

tween properties in the larger county unit. To aid in achieving this object we have created an Assessment Branch within the department.

This branch is composed of experienced urban and rural assessors whose duties are to advise and assist local assessors in establishing an equalized assessment in their municipalities and in comparison with other municipalities in Ontario.

The officials of this branch are available to advise local and county assessors at the request of their councils.

County assessors have been appointed in 15 counties in the province and several other counties are considering similar appointments.

In two counties, Brant and Huron, soil surveys were made during 1948, in co-operation with the soils survey branch of the Ontario Agricultural College, and it is hoped that the department can continue with this work in the coming year.

The department assessors assisted municipal assessors in the field, addressed many council and committee meetings, made inspection trips, attended and lectured at municipal schools, addressed municipal associations, trained and instructed new assessors, et cetera. The above-mentioned work necessitated some 272 days in the field.

Schools were conducted and lectures were given by officers of the department in 18 different locations in the province during 1948.

Each school was of three days duration, and the municipal subjects lectured upon and discussed were interesting and instructive to the 1,477 elected representatives and officers of the municipalities who attended.

In order to make certain that ratepayers of a municipality secure an accurate statement covering the financial activities of their municipality, the department requires that all persons auditing municipal accounts must have a license from the department.

The officials of the department have in the past year, where necessary, assisted municipal auditors to enable them to prepare reports that present a correct financial picture to the ratepayers of the municipality, and this assistance is available to any municipal auditor desiring same.

The officials of the department have attended meetings of auditors in order to assist them in preparing their audit reports, and when requested, will continue to give this service.

Following are statistics in reference to municipal auditors' licenses:

	Year ending Dec. 31, 1948	*Year ending Dec. 31, 1947*	*Year ending Dec. 31, 1946*
Examinations written	22	23	32
Applications passed	7	10	12
Licenses issued ...	352	384	421

A standard pension plan for adoption by municipal councils and local boards to provide pensions for their employees has been made available for distribution to all municipalities.

Fifty municipalities have approved pension plans in effect, and 6 applications are pending.

Eight municipalities are preparing plans, and have written in for information and assistance in arranging plans.

An official of the department has visited a number of municipalities at their request, to discuss plans with the local council, boards and associations.

Information re the standard pension plan has been given by interview to over 300 municipal officers and insurance company representatives. This includes visits to municipalities.

There was a question asked me the other day not regarding the Department of Municipal Affairs, but referring to "past service." It is up to the municipality to give consideration to past service. If they wish to enter into an agreement with their employees and the employees share in the amount of their past service, even if they have to borrow the money according to the Act, we have power to give them permission to borrow the money for past service, to bring the employees who have been there perhaps 30 or 35 years up on "an

even keel" with the others who are starting in as younger men. We think that is a good thing, and we have encouraged it.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Pardon me at this point, sir; the employees do not have to participate in past service, do they?

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, no, this is obsolutely voluntary.

MR. BROWN: I see.

MR. DUNBAR: That is what I say. However, if they decide to do so, we can, through our department, without going to the Municipal Board, issue debentures for the amount of past service. We can give them permission to raise the money.

The municipal directory which is published by the department giving the names and address of the reeve and clerk for the current year, together with the population, acreage and assessment figures, et cetera, was available for distribution March 4th, a copy of which was placed on the members' desks that day. I think this is a day or two earlier than in 1948.

I would like to take this opportunity of thanking municipal officials for their assistance in supplying the information from which this directory was compiled.

The department realizes the need for the publication of this directory at an early date. It is hoped, with the assistance of a few of the clerks who are dilatory in making their returns, and with a little more assistance on the part of the printer, to have the 1950 directory published at a much earlier date.

The Department of Municipal Affairs Annual Report of Municipal Statistics for the municipal fiscal year ending December 31st, 1947, was published and distributed October 14th, 1948.

This is somewhat earlier than in recent years due in part to the filing of improved audit reports covering municipal activities; a different method of preparing copy for the printer; and a much faster job on the part of the printer. With the assistance of municipal officials this report also can be published a month or two earlier. It is impossible for the department to prepare copy for the printer until the returns are received from the municipalities.

Again I would like to take this opportunity to thank municipal officials for their co-operation in forwarding the necessary information to compile the statistical report.

The following municipal statistics cover the municipal year ending December 31st, 1947:

Year	*Gross Debenture Debt Jan. 1*	*New Issues Approved by Board*	*Debenture Debt at End of Year*
1943	$305,420,000	$11,516,000	$281,437,000
1944	281,437,000	24,849,000	252,661,000
1945	252,661,000	36,001,000	230,884,000
1946	230,884,000	45,309,000	214,648,000
1947	214,648,000	81,390,000	219,914,000

Year	*Over-all Reduction or Increase During Year (R) or (I)*	*Indicated Principal Repayments During Year*
1943	(R) $23,983,000	$35,499,000
1944	(R) 28,776,000	53,625,000
1945	(R) 21,777,000	57,778,000
1946	(R) 16,236,000	61,545,000
1947	(I) 5,266,000	76,124,000

At the close of 1947 the gross debenture debt was $219,914,000 or $57.05 per capita and 6.6 per cent. of the assessed valuation. This is an increase of $5,266,000 over 1946, equivalent to a 2.5 per cent. increase.

The percentage of gross debenture debt to assessed valuation fell from 6.8 per cent. in 1946 to 6.6 per cent. in 1947.

The gross debenture debt in 1947 was increased for the first time since 1933.

Tax levies for the year 1947 amounted to $135,347,703, which represents an increase of $17,718,753 or 11.8 per cent. from the year 1946. This resulted in a $35 per capita levy in 1947. The levies for "Other than Education" amount to $90,739,254, compared with $80,504,043 in 1946. It is noted that the levies for education have increased by 12.0 per

cent. from 1946. When determining the total levy for educational purposes, it is necessary to add to the preceding amounts the amounts included in the county levies for education which, by means of the apportioning of county rates, the local municipalities are required to raise in their annual tax levies. County levies on municipalities include $1,123,377 for education which, added to $44,608,449 for education levies of the municipalities, results in $45,731,826 attributable to education or 33.8 per cent. of the total tax levies.

Current Tax Collections during 1947 increased by $14,597,227 from the year 1946 and amounted to $125,598,203, representing 92.43 per cent. of the 1947 levies.

Total Tax Collections in the year 1947 amounted to $133,406,269 or 98.57 per cent. of the 1947 levy, compared to 100.2 per cent. in the year 1946.

Tax Arrears amounted to $10,885,288, representing $2.82 per capita and 8.04 per cent. of the 1947 levy. This is comparable to $3 per capita and 9.5 per cent. for the year 1946.

Reserves, post-war and General amount to $6,602,335. Reserves for property acquired for taxes and contingencies amount to $9,434,966. There is also a tax reserve of $3,627,249.

Proportion acquired for taxes have decreased from $8,033,594 in 1946 to $5,135,715 in 1947 and as noted above, large amounts of such properties are either partially or fully reserved.

The Current Position of municipalities as contained in the summarized balance sheets is encouraging, attention is directed to the following highlights:

Cash on hand and in the banks	$12,028,727
Investments	6,793,394
Bank loans	9,978,140
Reserves	19,664,550
Surplus	15,096,430

For further information regarding municipal financing and operation costs I would refer you to the Department's Annual Report of Municipal Statistics which was placed on your desks at the opening of the session.

Supervised municipalities are those that were placed under Part III of The Department of Municipal Affairs Act by Order of the Ontario Municipal Board, or Improvement Districts that automatically come under Part III of the Department of Municipal Affairs Act when erected.

Municipalities under supervision, other than Improvement Districts, are those that at one time defaulted in their debt repayment, but who, now that their indebtedness has been refunded, still wish to remain under the supervision of the department.

Below is a list of all municipalities (other than Improvement Districts) under supervision as of December 31, 1948:

Townships: Sandwich East and R.C.S.S.S., No. 3. Sandwich West and R.C.S.S.S., No. 6. Teck and R.C.S.S.

Towns: Blind River and R.C.S.S., Essex and R.C.S.S., Haileybury and R.C.S.S., La Salle and R.C.S.S., Rainy River and R.C.S.S., Riverside and R.C.S.S., Rockland, Sturgeon Falls and R.C.S.S., Tecumseh and R.C.S.S.

Below is a list of Roman Catholic Separate School Boards still under the supervision of the department, and for which no Refunding Plans have been approved:

R.C.S.S. Board for the Town of Blind River.

R.C.S.S. Board for the Town of Haileybury.

R.C.S.S. Board for the Town of Sturgeon Falls.

R.C.S.S. Board for the Town of Tecumseh.

As I advised this House last year, the Ontario Municipal Board now consists of five members.

During the year 1948 there were 1,539 applications made to the Ontario Municipal Board. In the cases of 1,305 the applications were granted. 125 appli-

cations were dismissed, and the others were cancelled, withdrawn, reserved or adjourned.

For further particulars of the activities of the board may I refer you to the annual report of The Ontario Municipal Board covering the year ending December 31, 1948, already tabled with this Legislature.

The Supervisor of Telephone Systems reports that the number of systems within the jurisdiction of Ontario of which the Ontario Municipal Board has record, is 526, operating 158,913 telephones, 33,172 miles of pole lead, carrying 227,513 miles of wire, and representing an investment of nearly $15,000,000.

The chief functions of the office of the Registrar General, pursuant to the Vital Statistics Act, 1948, and Ontario Regulations 217/48, are as follows:

(a) To provide for the registration of births, marriages, death and stillbirths, ocurring within the Province of Ontario, and see that such registrations are properly filed and protected.

(b) To issue official certificates from such registrations on request therefor by the public.

(c) To prepare and issue annually a report of births, marriages, deaths and stillbirths, containing tables of statistics, based on such births, marriages, deaths and stillbirths.

Summary of registrations received during the years 1948 and 1947 are as follows:

	1948	*1947*
Births	109,802	105,916
Marriages	44,850	43,572
Deaths	45,870	41,558
Stillbirths	3,090	2,126
Total registrations	203,612	193,172

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) a question, and then I may have a little more to say about it, if I get the answer to the question. I am sure he will want to assist me, and I certainly want to assist him. I am speaking under the first vote, that is Vote No. 123.

Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was presenting his Budget speech he said, as reported at Page 560 of *Hansard,* on March 4:

"Legislation will be introduced immediately by the following Ministers to give effect to government proposals which are as follows:

1. By the Attorney-General."

This is followed by a brief description of the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) bill.

"2. By the Minister of Highways."

And then follows a brief description of that Minister's new legislation:

"3. By the Minister of Welfare."

There follows a corresponding description of his legislation:

"4. By the Minister of Municipal Affairs."

Here I am going to read the description which is given by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost):

"4. By the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Every municipality shall be guaranteed benefits under this plan of at least 1 mill, and should any municipality receive less than 1 mill of benefits under Nos. 1-3, inclusive, the Department of Municipal Affairs will make up the difference to a maximum benefit equal to the 1 mill subsidy payable in the year 1948.

Estimated ..... $500,000."

I see the $500,000 estimate does appear under Item 10 of vote 123. The point is that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) said on March 4th that legislation would be introduced to give effect to this guarantee, or floor under the grant to the municipalities. As far as I am able to ascertain, and as far as the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has been able to tell me, no such legislation has yet been introduced.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): I do not think it is necessary.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, you may not think it is necessary now, but you said it was on March 4th. Perhaps it is not necessary, but on March 4th the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) said that legislation to this effect would be introduced. I would like the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) to tell us what assurance the municipalities have that the undertaking given by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) on March 4th will be implemented, that is to say, that every municipality will be guaranteed benefits under the new plan of at least one mill, and that should any municipality receive less than one mill, under the new grant—under the new legislation—the difference will be made up.

I would like to know just what assurance can be given other than that which was found in the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) speech, because apparently when he made that speech, he thought legislation was necessary. Has he given it any thought since that time, or is he just telling us today without consideration that he does not think legislation is required?

MR. DUNBAR: I will answer insofar as my department is concerned, that $500,000 has been placed just the same as, in the past, $180,000 or so has been placed to help mining municipalities. This is an extra now, to see that no municipality in the province will receive less than they did last year. As far as I am concerned, my department is quite clear. I have the money, and I know the municipalities will trust me—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: —that I will see they receive a square deal, and that they will get as much money as they did last year, that is, if there happened to be any municipality which might suffer without that, they will not suffer because they will receive as much money as they received in 1948.

So far as the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) handing over the money to my department, that is his concern, and he can give you an explanation of that.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I am a little hazy on this. I thought they were to receive the equivalent of one-mill subsidy. What they received last year would be based on the 1947 assessment, whereas the one-mill subsidy would be on the 1948 assessment.

MR. DUNBAR: No, I did not say "one-mill subsidy," you do not catch me that way. I said the amount of money they received last year, and that was based on 1947 assessment, you are right. I did not say on the 1948 assessments, I said the amount of money they received in 1948. That was on the 1947 assessment.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to "catch" the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar).

MR. MacLEOD: He is pretty slippery.

MR. BROWN: I am just maintaining if they get just as much as they got last year, they are not getting as much as they would be entitled to in places where the assessment in 1948 has been increased over what it was in 1947. They should get more than they got last year.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. DUNBAR: You have got it right. That might be partly the cause of the whole thing. You put your finger "right on the button"; all you have to do is press it, because if you think we were going to sit around as a government and see municipalities advertise, and have its citizens run for mayor and controllers and reeves and different things, and tell their electors: "We have devised a scheme whereby we can take so much more money from the provincial government," you are wrong. Who does that come from? From the people of the Province of Ontario. That is who they would be taking the money from. They are not going to do it.

However, we are going to guarantee to any of the smaller municipalities which might not benefit from this scheme, so they will not lose out.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, but we cannot distribute $500,000 dollars by "pressing buttons."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister can.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Take Item 10, from Vote 123, "to provide for payment of a subsidy to certain municipalities as may be directed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, $800,000," which is broken down into: "Mining $300,000; Other $500,000"; is that the only authority under which the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is going to disburse the $500,000?

MR. DUNBAR: That is it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is no other authority, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is satisfied no other authority is required?

MR. FROST: No. I would say this, Mr. Chairman, my friend for South Waterloo—

AN HON. MEMBER: North Waterloo.

MR. FROST: I am sorry the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Brown) mentions the change of assessment in 1948. I think he will agree with this, that if we were to pin our formula to 1948, you would increase the disparities which we want to prevent being increased.

You see, the one-mill subsidy for years—you might say for 10 or 12 years—ran some place between about $2,900,000 and $3,300,000. As the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) says, it became quite apparent that if the amounts were going to be vastly increased, it meant this, that that disparity which existed would be increased, and the municipalities which really required the money and have in so many cases the real problems—take, for instance, the Yorks out here, and other places—would not be receiving the amounts they should receive of, say, the amount of $4,000,000 or $4,500,000 which the one-mill subsidy would probably grow into by this year.

As regards legislation, I might say legislation is not necessary to carry out this arrangement. It might have been better to have stated, it would have been better to have stated, that an amount would be placed in the estimates to take care of this. That is the expression I used, I think, some years ago, when we made provision for the mining municipalities. I said amounts would be placed in the estimates to take care of that situation.

This is just about the picture. We are changing over from one system to another.

We are confident that in the approach we are making we will get more equitable distribution of this money.

MR. FROST: My friend for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) has been mayor of Kitchener, and I think his municipality will benefit very greatly by this move. I think all municipalities in that class will benefit very greatly. I think my own community will benefit very greatly.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): I am sure they will.

MR. FROST: That is why they like me up there. After all, we are looking after the class of municipality which has been suffering from growing pains and require some assistance.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): And elect Tories.

MR. FROST: I might say, Mr. Chairman, we do not say our system is perfect by any means, but we do think it is a sound, sensible approach to the problem. If there are things that require provision, we will most certainly make them. Our idea is that experience will improve our system and we will finally

arrive at a situation where the municipalities will receive great benefits. I might say mention was made here in the House a few days ago about the new taxing sources for municipalities. That is an extremely difficult matter. We have looked at the situation in the City of New York, we have been in New York and they give cities of a certain population the right to levy income tax. Nothing can create chaos quicker than that. They give the right to levy amusement taxes and theatre taxes and things of that sort.

I should imagine that situation is not too satisfactory in the City of New York. It would mean that you would have three jurisdictions levying the same type of tax. Nothing but chaos could result. We are trying to eliminate that and get down to a situation where municipalities will have revenues adequate for the duties they perform.

As regard the amount received last year, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has properly said that he did not tie up to one mill. What this is tied to is the amount they received last year there, of course, the levy on one mill. However, I want to add to this and say we are going to add a guarantee to this expense to this Act proper, because we are changing certain percentages in gasoline tax. We are making this provision that we will pay the equivalent of what they received from the one-mill subsidy of last year. You see, if they are only going to pay half the amount of money they spent last year we are not paying a subsidy based on the larger amount, but we will make up the difference between the amount they would receive under the new percentage arrangement and based upon the amount expended last year. Therefore, no municipality will receive less than they received in 1948 from this source.

You can understand that this will take some little adjusting; in the majority of cases it will require no adjustment. I would say, generally speaking, in all of the municipalities having the status of a township, no adjustment will be required because, obviously, they will receive more money. In the developmental townships the probability is the mill rate is around 120 mills. Now a mill means very, very little, and in these townships they are bound under this arrangement to get 2 or 3 mills. We will probably find this in the good townships. There may be a difference for this reason that in the good townships, at the present time, we are doing all of the policing in most cases. Generally speaking, they have no fire protection except what they receive from the villages and towns, and, in that case, we pay the same subsidy, 25 per cent., if they have any arrangement for fire protection in these localities. Their assistance will come from grants to the Children's Aid Societies, County Homes and that sort of thing.

The proposal is that if a township rate does not equal one mill or more than it did in 1948, we make it up to that.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a question so as to have a proper interpretation of what the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has told us. The fact remains that in the change over in the City of Windsor there was a difference of $52,000. As I understand it, they were out $52,000 in the change over in subsidy on road grants. Am I right in assuming from what the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) have said, that this government will reimburse that city and other cities for that amount of money? In other words, the City of Windsor can look forward to a $52,000 grant on that score?

MR. FROST: We understand your municipality was one of the few municipalities where there was some difficulty and we are taking care of that.

MR. ELLIS: That difference will be made up?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. J. M. NEWMAN (LL Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I notice on Item 10, $300,000 for mining. Would it be

possible to find out how this is distributed and how a mining area has to qualify for some of that money? I have in mind the $180,000 that was voted last year, and I noticed by a question that was answered the other day there was approximately $26,000 of this money which had not been spent. I can think of one mining area which did not receive any, namely, Steep Rock or Atikokan. Would it be possible for some of that money that was not spent to be used in that area or would some of this $300,000 be paid out for that purpose.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Yes, I know you have made reference to Atikokan. A cheque went forward today for Atikokan. I made arrangements out of the balance of last year. That is why you will notice in the estimates for the expenditures for last year the report that we spent $193,000, but we had only $180,000. However, we had a balance from the year prior and we paid some before the 31st of March, their fiscal year, to help them out, to several municipalities. We advanced the money to Kirkland Lake, Timmins, Tisdale—that is why that was possible to give out $193,000 when we only had $180,000 in the estimates, because we had a balance from the former year and also on account of the three months difference in their fiscal year and ours. We have paid them $11,800.

In the municipality, in Atikokan, there was a little difficulty because of going after low-grade ore off the "A" bore instead of the one they were working on. The profits were not very great, in fact, they were not there at all. Atikokan had started on waterworks and sewers and we did not feel they should be disappointed. They started on this programme and we have sent them this $11,800.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question. The last time I was up that way there was considerable complaint from the miners about their not having a representative on the board, which, I understand, is appointed from here. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would give some indication of his willingness, when the opportunity arrives, to consider putting some of the representatives of the miners on that board. As it is now, there is representation of the mine management, a representation of the business interests of the community but no representation of the persons who work in the mines. For that reason, they feel left out of it. I call that matter to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) and ask him to do something about it when the opportunity arises.

MR. DUNBAR: I appreciate that, also, but we have had great difficulty in Atikokan getting the three members for the board. We had one from the Steep Rock Mining Company and one a retired railroader also we had Mrs. McInnes, who went into some other business. She was secretary-treasurer and was very efficient. Things were going very nicely. Now, for a considerable time last year we had only the two representatives, the bank manager was moving away and he was on the board. Apparently the three years will soon be up and according to the Act, amended last year, on Improvement Districts Act, after three years we may have an opportunity to reform the Act and they will be able to elect their own representative.

MR. PARK: I would suggest that one of the representative groups in the area of Atikokan and Steep Rock should be the union to which almost everyone belongs. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) might well consider appointing an officer of the union if there is a vacancy available.

MR. DUNBAR: I will but it had not been recommended to me. However, I will take it into consideration.

MR. W. S. GEMMELL (PC Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I realize that hon. members and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) are aware that the City of Sudbury are going to—

MR. JOLLIFFE: We are aware you had a pre-election conference.

MR. GEMMELL: —I am not going to argue that point.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, you had better stay off that point.

MR. GEMMELL: I would like to explain the Mining Tax Act of Northern Ontario. It performs pretty well the same service as a business assessment in Southern Ontario. In a large district under the present Mining Tax Act, when the mine was situated within the boundaries of the municipality, the present Tax Act takes over. In the particular district in which I live, we have only one municipality in which a mine is situated where a large population exists. For some number of years there has been a demand on the part of mining municipalities to change the Act. Under the present government, the idea is to make grants to meet the situation. We will receive these grants and they will be of great assistance to the municipality. In the City of Sudbury, I think you can safely say, 60 per cent. of the people living in this city are directly employed by the Nickel Mines. While the City of Sudbury was not receiving any assistance under the Mining Tax Act and while their business assessment was under $1,000,000 now that it is from $4,000,000 to $6,000,000, I think they are entitled to it. I would like the government to do this; instead of making grants, have a thorough examination made of the situation with regard to the position of the Mining Tax Act, so that it could be put into the statute books, after considerable study, because I know it is a very difficult problem to see that the distribution under the Mines' income assessments will take care of the situation as it exists, as I know it does exist up through the gold belt area.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Has Sudbury got that $900,000 yet, which was promised nine months ago, to get you elected?

MR. FROST: Do you not think it worked all right?

MR. TAYLOR: I am glad to hear the explanation of my friend from Sudbury (Mr. Gemmell). I can go along with him on the need for assistance to the mining municipalities. Unfortunately one of the towns which I represent is the old town of Cobalt, which was too late to get in on these subsidies. In 1947 the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs did give us $5,000. I do not know whether that went to make up part of the $100,000 Sudbury is getting now or not, but I would like to know why we are not qualified under the Act now for assistance. We are exactly in the same position as Sudbury. The mines working there now are outside the boundaries of the town of Cobalt, and the people working in the mines live in Cobalt, and are serviced by the town of Cobalt. We provide schools, and sidewalks, and police protection, and fire protection, and so forth. Most of these people would not be there, were it not for the mines outside of the town demanding the service for its employees. I understand we are in exactly the same category as Sudbury, Timmins, or any of the other mining municipalities. It is true we did receive $5,000 in 1947. That was discontinued in 1948, and I asked the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) if there was anything for us this year, and he shook his head "No."

This mining tax, as the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Gemmell) has pointed out, is too serious to be left to the whims of any one Minister. For instance what yardstick does the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) use to measure who shall get what? Who decides on whether Sudbury will get it, or Cobalt or Timmins or Kirkland Lake, and on what basis they will get it? I would not like to say it was because of politics. I think the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has done well by Cobalt in the past. I have had a lot of dealings with him, but I would like him to explain the yardstick that he uses for handing out this money. It is too serious a problem to be left to any one man.

MR. DUNBAR: The yardstick you were measured by was that you had a fire. Just listen to this, and be fair about it. You had a fire, and your

municipality approached me and said they could purchase some pumping equipment for about $9,000. They had $4,500, and they wanted $4,500 from me. I spoke to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), and we gave them $5,000. That was after the fire. It was not on the same basis as the other at all. That was in 1947, after the fire in Cobalt. That is why they got the $5,000.

You may think you have some legitimate reasons, but you have not the same reasons they have in Kirkland Lake, Timmins, South Porcupine and the other municipalities, another one where Howard is the mayor—Larder Lake, or in Sudbury or up in Atikokan, where the mine is right there.

They were taxed on the same basis as industry. This is from profits tax, according to the Act, and under that you are entitled to 15 mills on the first $2,333,000. Then the Act was changed, and it went up another $2,333,000, and they got another ten mills, which made 25 mills on the profits tax. Then, during the war and since, the mines had great difficulty, because mining had dropped down some, and they were left, as it were "holding the bag" to a considerable extent. We have a five year agreement with them. We have a floor; Kirkland Lake gets 15 mills, and another 15 mills, which makes 30 mills; Timmins get 15 mills and 10 mills, and so forth. We agreed with them because they felt their need was greater in some places than in others. As far as Larder Lake was concerned, it was just a lump sum.

Up in Geraldton they are to be pitied more than any other municipality in the mining district. They were in great difficulties, and they had a deficit of $10,000. We checked over their budget, and found it was good, sound financing, nothing extravagant about that at all, and that is how we arrived at the figure of $10,000 for Geraldton.

These are the two places. The others were decided on the mill rate, on the profits, and all the municipalities agreed to that floor for five years, and that is how we carried on.

MR. TAYLOR: What is the difference between the situation at Sudbury, where the industries are outside the town, but Sudbury is providing for the services for the employees who work in the mines, because the municipality has to provide those services, and they came in for a portion of the amount of the taxation on that property. I assume that is correct—

MR. DUNBAR: The problem is entirely different. There are thousands of people living in Sudbury, where there would only be a few in yours.

MR. TAYLOR: What is that?

MR. DUNBAR: There is all the difference in the world.

MR. TAYLOR: We still have the children to educate, and we still have the old sidewalks, and the old school buildings, and all those other old things, which were left there by one of the most horrible examples of "free enterprise" there ever was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TAYLOR: I would like to tell the story of what happened in Cobalt.

MR. DUNBAR: And tell us about the percentage you got on the school taxes?

MR. TAYLOR: I can tell you all about it. We want to get in on the mining tax. Under the old system you appointed an assessor who levied the tax on mining property, and he was a man, I think, by the name of Nickel, and under that Act the mining companies were getting a cut in their profits, by doing almost anything under the sun. If they were running an office in China they charged it up, and the result was there was no profit, until the first war came along in 1914, when the Federal Government stepped in—and this might be a good argument for the dominion-provincial relations—into that field, and they took over the taxation on the profits of the mines.

But what did we find? They would not take your auditors from Ontario, nor

your assessors; they sent in their own men, and the first year they assessed the mining corporation, I believe we got something in the neighbourhood of $20,000 out of the profits that year. When that was over, and the tax reverted back to this government, the profits went down, and we were deprived of our share of the profits tax again. There is exactly the same situation existing there today. The Miller silver mine is outside of Cobalt, and the O'Brien mine is outside of Cobalt, but 75 per cent. of their employees live in the town, and their children have to be educated. They go to our schools, and we provide the police, and all the various services which go to make up a municipality, and we have to tax the individual even for the shack he owns, which is not even on his own land. The mine companies own the land on which his house is built. The only thing we can do is to tax, and our tax rate now is 100 mills, and we should be entitled to some subsidy at this time. Speaking about this situation in Geraldton, and they being entitled to something on the basis of need, and Kirkland Lake being entitled to something on the basis of need; may I say definitely that Cobalt is entitled to something on the basis of need.

MR. GEMMELL: In justice to the hon. Minister's (Mr. Dunbar), the figures as to what Sudbury will get are fair, I said, in the first place, only one township in our municipality receives benefits as laid down under the Mine Tax Act at present. I understand from the mining tax they will receive a sum in the neighbourhood of $27,000. Sudbury will get $100,000. There is no comparison whatsoever in the service each provides, and I say that $100,000 is a very normal figure.

What I am trying to say is that the mining tax should distribute funds to provide these municipal services. I think the figure Sudbury will get is certainly fair for the services rendered, in comparison with the population. We still have one township not receiving any benefits, and that is a township in which the corporate City of Sudbury is situated. But there are two mine companies going into production in there, in 1950 and 1951, and their problem will be taken care of, under the present Act.

In fairness to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) I think the amount to Sudbury was fair and just. I do not think anybody on the other side of the House could argue otherwise, but I would say this again, that a thorough study should be made of the various problems, and they are very difficult ones to deal with. I think something should be done to make a study of that, so that the whole matter could be more adequately taken care of.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We have been asking for that for six years.

MR. DUNBAR: For what?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just what the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Gemmell) is asking for.

MR. GEMMELL: I presented a brief some years ago to the Mining Commission on this problem. I do not think an Act should be brought in which might destroy the initiative of mining operations. In the gold field the municipalities have a much more difficult problem than we have. The nickel industry is expanding industrially, whereas in gold mining the profits vary a great deal, according to the economic conditions at the moment. I say a study should be made of it, and a very thorough one, to see if we cannot find an equitable means of distributing these funds, different than the system we have at the moment.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Gemmell) to say the municipality had not received the $100,000 as was promised nine months ago?

MR. FROST: The arrangement was this; the City of Sudbury would receive $100,000 in the year 1949, and I told the mayor and everybody, as far as I knew, that it would be paid when the estimates were voted by this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In other words, it was an election committee, for which there was no authority given by this House.

MR. FROST: There was no thought of an election.

MR. MacLEOD: It is quite obvious that the $100,000 was offered with the election in mind.

MR. FROST: Oh, never thought of it.

MR. MacLEOD: That was 9 months ago. The full gestation is over, and I suggest you deliver the goods.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: It will be paid. I advised the council and the mayor up there, that this money would be paid as soon as the estimates were brought down, and the money voted by the Legislature. We do things in an orderly way over here.

MR. MacLEOD: I am sure you have clean hands and a pure heart.

MR. FROST: We are the representatives of the people, and we do things in an orderly way.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): How did you arrive at this figure of $100,000?

MR. FROST: It seemed like a fair amount.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR: Never before, until this government came in, was there anything in the budget to assist the mining municipalities. We were the first government to do anything for them.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, speaking to number 7 in vote 123, I notice $5,400 for the celebration of the municipal centennial. I think that is a splendid idea. Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) tell us something about it?

MR. DUNBAR: I made an offer to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that if this was not satisfactory, either to him or to any other hon. member, I would withdraw it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Nobody has asked you to withdraw it.

MR. DUNBAR: You did.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I did not. I said no such a thing. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) and I are very good friends, and he must have his little joke. In fact, most of what he contributes in this House is a joke.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But I made no such statement, Mr. Chairman. In fact, I corrected him at the time, and he knows it.

MR. DUNBAR: I was not joke enough to capture you down at Belleville. They had to get the police to capture you, when you were down there. That is a good one on you. When you were captured, we never heard another word about "Blackwell's Black Legs." That was settled right there, by "Let me go, and I will never say another word."

Mr. Chairman, to get back to the municipalities; I have not had any complaints from the municipalities. It is funny I hear them here. They have not been to my office, and they have never complained about the treatment they are receiving.

MR. HOUCK: I am not complaining. I asked the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) a fair question, what this celebration was for. I agree with it 100 per cent.

MR. DUNBAR: I will answer your question fairly.

MR. HOUCK: Answer it now.

MR. DUNBAR: We did not know whether to hold the celebration here in Toronto, and invite different representatives from the different provinces. We had been looking around to see if we could get accommodations in sufficient number—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would you like to have it in Ottawa?

MR. DUNBAR: I would not mind, and I had not thought of it. That would be a splendid place, in the capital of Canada. That is a good thing. Thank you very kindly.

MR. HOUCK: What about Niagara Falls?

MR. DUNBAR: I will drop the Toronto idea right away. We were planning to get out some sort of a souvenir booklet for the celebration. We were looking for accommodations during the Exhibition—

MR. MACLEOD: For that amount of money, I suggest that it might be held over and spent up in Lindsay—$5,400.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, so there will be no further misunderstanding about this matter whatsoever, I referred some time ago to the fact that the year 1949 would represent the 100th anniversary of the Municipal Act, and I said in that connection I noticed an item in the estimates as a contribution toward the cost of the celebration of the centennial. For some reason, quite unknown to me, the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) got it into his head that I was objecting to the item. I never objected to the item whatsoever. I am now going to refer—

MR. DUNBAR: You were objecting to so many I thought you were objecting to everything.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are altogether too touchy. What is on your conscience. I think the centennial is a very good thing. Is that clear?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, and it is surprising to me that any of the people in Ontario ever sent you here.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us come to something else. This has nothing to do with Belleville, although I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will be wandering off to Belleville, as he always does, when he gets into trouble. This is not said by way of criticism. I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has the explanation at his fingertips. I take it the work in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Dunbar) office has greatly expanded.

MR. DUNBAR: That is correct.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There must be a great many more people working in your office.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, and we expect to have a few more this year. We are looking for assessors.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That comes under "Head office"?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The duties of those working in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Dunbar) office must have increased enormously because for the year ended March 31, 1947, the item for salaries in the main office was $56,043, in the Public Accounts. This was not in the estimates, but in the Public Accounts, and was the amount actually spent. To be exact, it was $56,043.19.

MR. MACLEOD: Now he wants to make it an even $58,000.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No. In this year's estimates the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has calculated the salaries will cost, in the main office, $104,000.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, and that is an increase of $4,480 over last year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It happens to be just about double what it was two years ago. I am not complaining about it. I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has the explanation at his fingertips, but it represents a very large increase, and does not include the cost-of-living bonus, so I take it he must have a much larger staff. Is that due to the assistance in the re-assessments, or what is the main cause?

MR. DUNBAR: The assistance we are giving the municipalities. We have to have more qualified people working in the department, if we are going to properly inspect our schools, and if we are going to set examinations and

inspect the auditors, we must have more people in that branch. I explained in my initial remarks, that in 1943 the duties of the department were particularly to look after 42 municipalities, that is, giving the municipalities the service they required.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are doing much more now than you did two years ago?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes. We are trying to increase it, because we have these four assessors going around continually.

MR. HOUCK: Are these schools on an experimental basis, or will they be permanent from now on?

MR. DUNBAR: They will be permanent.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Why should they not be transferred to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

MR. LESLIE E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, this is the most important department of the government now, and we are going over these figures rather carefully. It used to be the Department of Education which was the most important, but municipalities have come into their rightful place as the most important thing to be worried about by the present government.

I may say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that quite frankly I am very glad the Department of Municipal Affairs has grown up into a full-fledged department, under his direction. I think he is rather well liked amongst municipal people throughout the province. I am not handing out bouquets at the moment; I am simply stating facts.

I would like to say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that it is all well and good to put an item of $500,000 into these estimates, to make good the new over-all, untried scheme of assistance to the municipalities. I said before in this House that we were not very much in favour of the one-mill subsidy, based on assessments.

I could still say I am not in favour but I must qualify that, as I did then, I would like to see something better in its place.

MR. FROST: That is what you have got.

MR. WISMER: No, we do not get it as yet, and that is what I want to say again here on this estimate, because this is the item that balances off all accounts. What we really have in this Vote No. 123, Sub-section 100, a $500,000 item, it is a balancing item. A good guess as to what it may cost to bring everybody up to the same minimum level.

I would like to deal with that first. Maybe this will work out. What is more important is that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), the department really charged with looking after municipalities—as I said, it has grown up under the present Minister, and is now a full-fledged organization—is the place, it seems to me, that a reasonable plan should evolve. I think there should be a little more money in this estimate, Mr. Minister. There should be enough money in this for you to continue to conference with the representative municipal bodies and their continuing committees—not interim plans should be the order of the day, but with some solid plan on which we could base our ideas and our administration, "vis a vis," the Provincial Government and the many municipalities for years to come. On this matter of $300,000, I presume $100,000 for Sudbury is included in that, and that means you have $200,000 for the other municipalities. I would just like to say a word about the mining municipalities. The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Gemmell) brought up the Sudbury situation and the hon. member of Temiskaming (Mr. Taylor), talked about back history of mining municipalities and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) reminded the government we were asking that something be done about this in 1943 and 1944. My submission is this: that, while it is true that something has been

done in the way of grants to individual mining municipalities by this government, the actual problem created by the insistence of the municipalities away from the actual physical location of the mining property—that situation is a continuing problem and it is no longer a temporary problem. By that I mean that nothing is more completely established in Northern Ontario than the gold mining industry. I am sure neither the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) or the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Frost) is going to question that statement. This is an industry of Northern Ontario that is now well-established—just as well-established as the nickel-copper industry. The problems, so far as the municipalities are concerned are on exactly the same basis. There may be differences in population, differences in distances, differences in certain specific respects, but the problem is exactly the same. It is a problem which the government of this province in this day created itself, and it is a problem—the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is quite correct in those adjustments that have been made on an interim and specific basis—it is a problem which has not been faced up to. Now, it would be very nice to be able to say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that he has solved the problem in the southern part of the province, why does not he go up and solve it again. Unfortunately, you have not solved it in the southern part and the northern part needs it just as much, and they are two distinct separate municipal problems. You cannot go in and tax a mining property the way you tax an industrial property. But to say that this government must go into the mine and tax its profits and then agree with a municipality adjacent to it, that it will send some of that back—

MR. FROST: We do not agree with anything of the sort.

MR. WISMER: That is not solving the problem.

MR. FROST: It is not, and that is not what happens.

MR. WISMER: In effect, it is exactly what happens.

MR. FROST: No.

MR. WISMER: What I am suggesting to the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) is this: that the time has come, regardless of the price of gold and the price of the Canadian dollars and all these other considerations which at the moment affect gold mining; regardless of the terrific profits of the International Nickel Company, regardless of all mining problems, locations of ore bodies, regardless of all those things, the problems of the municipalities must be faced up to. I am not going to stand and say how you are going to face up to it. The people who have been responsible for the administration of the municipalities in Northern Ontario have had a lot of ideas, and they have made a lot of these ideas known at various times to this government, and I suggest—the same as I suggested earlier in regard to the municipalities of what you may call "old" Ontario— the settled municipalities, industrial municipalities —that what we really need is a lot less of these balancing items in the Department of Municipal Affairs, and a solution based on continuing confidence, a solution which provides this one basic thing, that the municipality may be allowed to stand on its own feet as a local government, capable of taxing on its own limited tax base, sufficient to bear the burdens it ought to have, and that ought to be the situation in old Ontario and ought to be the situation in Northern Ontario and it should not be necessary for this government to be either an intervener or a beneficial society.

MR. FROST: What would your method be with the mining municipalities?

MR. WISMER: Well, I do not propose—

MR. FROST: It is a $64 question.

MR. WISMER: I will give you the $64 answer.

MR. FROST: Well, well.

MR. WISMER: I will give you the $64 answer right now. You convene a conference of the municipalities of Northern Ontario.

MR. FROST: We have met them hundreds of times.

MR. WISMER: Do you want my answer?

MR. PORTER: You are great for conferences.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Drew used to like them.

MR. WISMER: If you want to go into that argument we could have a lot of argument, but it is getting late.

I say the answer to these things comes within sound negotiation and collaboration between the government and the municipalities. Whether the idea is formulated on this side of the House or the other side is no—

MR. PORTER: What is the solution?

MR. WISMER: I will give you a solution if you would like my ideas.

MR. PORTER: That is what we asked you for three times.

MR. WISMER: Get the mines of northern Ontario inside the municipalities that service them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Do you really think now that we have been sitting idly by all the time? We have not had conferences—we have not been doing anything? We had assessors throughout the mining municipalities last year and, if the Act was changed, to give them the same powers they had in southern Ontario. What did we find? We have asked the municipalities to send their own assessors into some of the mines in order to compare with our figures, because we found we had been paying them less money than we pay them under this Mining Tax Act, and we did not feel that the municipality could get along with less money, and we have made an agreement for five years if there was an improvement they will get more. But we have not been standing idly by. We have been endeavouring to solve this problem. It is a big problem in a lot of municipalities. It is a problem right now—where there are people living out in the townships here and working down in the big insurance companies and offices and hotels.

They have been collecting property taxes and business taxes, while these men have been living in small homes in the township, educating their families; so I say it is a big thing, it is not only in the mining municipalities, it is all over the country. Of course, if they would just trust me to solve the problems around here, I think I could do so in very short order, but the trouble is—

AN HON. MEMBER: But who would trust you?

MR. DUNBAR: —When I make a suggestion, I get "in wrong."

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Tell us about annexation.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, you mention something about annexation?

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is right.

MR. DUNBAR: You will see in five years, that is what they will have, and they will be asking for annexation. That is the only answer. They may talk about all their fancy names, but the only answer is annexation for the municipalities outlying around Toronto to get a share of these few taxes collected down in the business centre, which they own part and parcel of, and I am not backward in saying that.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is not serious when he says I suggested they did not hold conferences. What I urged him to do was to get on with the job.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes?

MR. WISMER: I can assure him if he will set up the plans for the erection of a metropolitan area in this district, the City of Toronto, and its environs, we will bring 17 "CCF'ers" in from dif-

ferent districts to support him right down the line on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: Give us the tools and we will finish the job.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): I think this is as good a time as any, during the Estimates, to clear the air on a matter which has been agitating the minds of the people. It is this; does the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) think the abolition of the one-mill grant was prompted to a large extent by the fact that Toronto began its re-assessment programme, with the resultant large increase in assessment value, or was it not?

There are many people, I suggest, who say that was the element which motivated this government. I do not think that was the only reason. My own opinion is there was more than one. I do not think it is necessary for me to elaborate on them and explain them, but there is this feeling, that the Government of Ontario, this government, hastened the abolition of the one-mill grant in order to "beat Toronto to it" just as it was completing its re-assessment programme.

MR. DUNBAR: I just love Toronto the same as I do any other municipality.

MR. SALSBERG: I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would make a statement that would clear the air.

MR. DUNBAR: Does the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) really give me credit for thinking that far ahead?

MR. SALSBERG: Well, I think not unhighly of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), and I think, either he alone, or with other Ministers, might have thought that far ahead.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, oh.

Items Nos. 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 123 agreed to.

MR. SALSBERG: I assume, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) refuses to make a statement on that point?

MR. DUNBAR: You asked me what I thought. I am not going to tell you what I am thinking. I am going to keep that to myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Then the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) refuses to give us an explanation?

MR. JOLLIFFE: He is very discreet.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (CCF Ontario): Mr. Chairman, while on the subject of the one-mill subsidy, we can appreciate that the government has guaranteed to the municipalities they will not get less than they received last year, but the grants to some of the municipalities will fall below the one-mill subsidy; I think you will admit that; therefore, if the one-mill subsidy is based, as it was last year, it means some municipalities which have shown a healthy growth in assessment—I am not referring to Toronto more than elsewhere in the province, but some municipalities have—if their grant is to be based on assessment last year, those people are going to take a cut, getting a reduction; is that right?

MR. FROST: Perhaps they will need more firehalls and more policemen and things like that.

MR. DUNBAR: Very few of those rural municipalities, such as in your district, will suffer any, I think. I know they put in a county assessor in Ontario, and the assessment was larger to a certain extent, but I do not think to the extent they would suffer by this. No, I think that was a fair and equitable assessment they put in. If it were the same as some other municipalities, it might probably have been, but I do not think the hon. gentleman, the member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) will have any reason to fear any of his municipalities suffering.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): What I am trying to bring out, Mr. Chairman, is this: If the grant is based on the assessment last year, there has been a healthy growth in assessment last year, therefore, they have taken a reduction.

Some of these municipal grants for police protection, fire protection, children's aid, and homes of the aged, will still bring them below the one-mill subsidy they received last year.

Vote 124.

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 124 agreed to.

Vote 125.

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule S agreed to.

Vote No. 125 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Is the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) not here? If not, I think we will take up the estimates of the Department of Mines.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): This is a tough one.

MR. FROST: Well, yes. I would propose we do not hurry through the Department of Mines. I have one or two items here. The Department of the Provincial Auditor, which is a short item; we could take it before 6 o'clock, I think.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): What page?

MR. FROST: Page 84, the office of the Provincial Auditor, Vote 134.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, that statutory figure, $9,000, is that the auditor's salary? Is that it?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the salary fixed by statute.

MR. WISMER: Well, this morning we were discussing the question of the position of the Provincial Auditor, and I think I am probably in order to say there was some feeling expressed by some hon. members that the Provincial Auditor's position should be a very important one, capable of watching the treasury on behalf of the House.

If we are to be consistent, and in years to come amend The Audit Act sufficiently to make that possible, to place upon the shoulders of one man in his department the watching of the entire government on behalf of the Legislature, then I can only suggest the salary paid to that man would have to undergo some revision upward.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) that Mr. Cotnam's salary of $9,000 is not sufficient. The fact of the matter is I myself intended this year it should be "upped" to the extent of $1,000.

MR. WISMER: It should come up at least on a parity with the Deputy Treasurer's salary.

MR. FROST: I will check into that anyway. He is a very excellent man.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): I am in hearty agreement with what the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) said. It seems to me, with the responsibility he would have to assume, irrespective of what the Audit Act says, his salary is much too low.

Items 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule S agreed to.

Vote No. 134 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): If that is passed I would like to call the item, "Miscellaneous," at the end. Page 111, "Miscellaneous."

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, what is that for? Who gets it, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost)?

MR. FROST: I may say, Mr. Chairman, this miscellaneous item is actually an item which is placed in the estimates to take care of a great variety of things.

MR. MacLEOD: A multitude of sins.

MR. FROST: You might say it is sort of a "catch-all." I will simply read this explanation here. This estimated expenditure on Ordinary Account provides for:

1. Refunds of overpayment of revenue—as in the case of Succession Duty, Corporation Tax, etc.

2. Refunds of revenue not acceptable, such as license fees when license not granted, etc.

3. Refunds of revenue where tax has been indirectly paid to the province on non-taxable items, such as Gasoline Tax refunds to farmers in respect to gasoline used in tractors.

This estimated expenditure on Capital Account provides for:

Refunds—Special Funds such as:

Cash Surety Bonds

School Board deposits re capital expenditures

Bequests

Employees contributions re Canada Savings Bonds, etc.

NOTE

The revenue refunds applicable to revenue collected in a coinciding fiscal period will be journalized out of miscellaneous refunds and charged against the respective revenue at the end of each month. The revenue refunds applicable to revenue collected in a prior year will remain as a charge against the appropriation.

Estimated for the year ending March 31, 1949—Ordinary Account	$100,000
Estimated for the year ending March 31, 1949—Capital Account	$150,000

COMPARISONS

Estimated for the year ending March 31, 1949:	
Ordinary	$ 75,000
Capital	75,000
Estimated for the year ending March 31, 1948	$100,000
Estimated for the year ending March 31, 1947	100,000
Estimated for the year ending March 31, 1946	100,000
Estimated for the year ending March 31, 1945	100,000

This is an account which provides for the payment of a host of different items. We may have refunds coming from estates, for overpayments and things of that kind, and these all go through this account.

MR. BROWN: It is a net figure.

MR. FROST: Yes, that is right.

MR. NIXON: May I ask the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) what would be an example of capital payment? Would this be from the Federal Government, in connection with old-age pensions, or something like that?

MR. FROST: It is on this sheet, but I am unable to find it. I do not know that I can give one to my learned friend at the moment, but I would be glad to advise him later. My friend (Mr. Nixon) might ask the auditor about that in the Public Accounts.

MR. NIXON: I see you ask for $150,000 for capital and only $100,000 for ordinary.

MR. FROST: This shows the refunds transferred as a charge against revenue of $11,991,025.83, and refunds applicable to revenue of prior years $18.087.38, making a total of $12,009,113.21.

MR. NIXON: That is on Vote 193.

MR. FROST: I have the Public Accounts here, but I do not think it gives me very much information. It says "requests to charitable and educational, $400; outstanding cheques, $1,100—oh, I would suggest my friend should ask about this in the Public Accounts.

Vote 193 agreed to.

Vote 194 agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report it has come to certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report certain

resolutions, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I may say to the hon. members of the House that since ten o'clock last night we have made very remarkable progress indeed. I was surprised at the progress we made after 11 o'clock last night, and again this afternoon. It was my expectation that the government orders would not be completed before perhaps 9 o'clock tonight. Instead of that, we have cleared them up, and cleared up some of the estimates. It, therefore, is not necessary to hold a night session, and when we adjourn we will stand adjourned until 3 o'clock tomorrow.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is very good news indeed. I suppose it has nothing to do with the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). But whether it has or not, it is very good news.

MR. FROST: I have had some requests to the effect that the hon. members would like to hear whether my forecast in connection with the Dominion Budget will come true.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I hope the acting Premier (Mr. Frost) is keeping in mind that we cannot very well sit in the evening tomorrow.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, is the acting Premier (Mr. Frost) prepared to tell us what will be dealt with tomorrow afternoon?

MR. FROST: It is our intention to go ahead with Estimates. There may be some other matters on the Order paper, which we will be able to take care of, but we intend to go ahead with Estimates tomorrow—bills and Estimates.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 of the clock p.m.

Vol. III, No. 30

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 23, 1949

Report of Standing Committee on Municipal Law, Mr. McPhee 1173
Public Land Act, bill to amend, Mr. Scott (Peterborough), first reading 1173
Oleomargarine, bill respecting, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading 1174
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1177
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1182
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1209

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1949

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

THE SPEAKER: As I announced a few days ago, it is our pleasure in this House to welcome various pupils from the different localities within an easy radius of the city to witness our Assembly. Today, however, we are particularly pleased to have 50 pupils from Lafontaine, near Penetang, over 100 miles away, who have come down to visit us on this occasion. They are in charge of the three sisters who conduct the school, and I am sure we are more than happy to welcome these young French-Canadian citizens of this province of ours to this afternoon's session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. J. D. McPHEE (PC Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of The Standing Committee on Municipal Law, and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. McPhee, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, begs leave to present the following as its report:

The Committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act";

Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act";

Bill No. 140, "An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act";

Bill No. 141, "An Act to amend The Local Improvements Act."

The Committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 104, "An Act to amend The Assessment Act";

Bill No. 133, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

PUBLIC LAND ACT

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Kelley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Public Lands Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) please explain?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, at the present time we have no authority in the province to set aside land for management units, research units and so on. This bill gives us authority to do that.

Also, under The Settlement Act, a settler has gone in and made his necessary improvements on the land, and, sometimes before his letters patent have been issued, has moved away from the area. This is rather an injustice, and we are correcting that in that it is no longer necessary that he be residing right on the grounds at the time he receives his patent.

The most important feature of this Act is dealing with the old patented lands upon which there were pine timber reservations. I feel the details of how that is being handled could be better discussed in second reading or committee, when you can read them. However, it is rectifying the situation which existed in southwestern Ontario for many years, and has been a grave source of trouble.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

OLEOMARGARINE

HON. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy), I move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act respecting Oleomargarine" and that same be now read a first time.

MR. T. K. FOSTER (L Bruce): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) kindly explain some of the features of the bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I will be glad to do so, Mr. Speaker. Also in the absence of the hon. Premier (Mr. Kendeny) I feel I should give a clear statement to the House in order to alleviate any unnecessary misunderstanding which might occur with respect to this bill before it comes to second reading.

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members of this House are aware, we were placed in this position due to the fact an old Act which was on the federal statutes for a great many years was placed before the Supreme Court by the Federal Government and they handed down a ruling to the effect that the Act was *ultra vires*. The unfortunate part of it was that that ruling happened to be handed down at a time when no Legislature in the provinces was sitting, in order that they might be able to deal with it before the product was thrown on the market, because it would have been much better, and would have created a great deal less confusion, if proper regulations had been set up for the manufacture and sale of this product prior to the distribution of it to the consumers.

This government agrees with the brief presented by The Federation of Agriculture that the Federal Government should have taken steps to provide dominion-wide uniform regulations to control the manufacture and sale of this product. Perhaps no food product was ever placed on the market in such a manner by permission of the Federal Government, without taking steps under the Pure Food Act to regulate the quality and constituent parts of the product.

Since the Federal Government has ignored their responsibility to the consumers of this product, and the producers of dairy products in Canada, this government feels that we should not evade our responsibility in the manner in which the Federal Government has evaded theirs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GOODFELLOW: After taking into consideration the interest of the consumers of this product as well as the manufacturers of dairy products, whose interests will be detrimentally affected by the sale of this competitive product, produced from cheap vegetable oils which are allowed to enter Canada without restriction, we feel some steps should be taken to protect at least to some degree the investment and economic welfare of one of the most important industries in the province and of the people engaged in supplying dairy products, in which a great deal of labour and investment is involved, and which industry, if not pro-

tected to some degree, will ultimately suffer and affect detrimentally all our people.

This bill, presented at this time, provides that every public eating place shall advertise the fact that oleomargarine is served in that establishment.

It provides that oleomargarine shall not be mixed with butter for purposes of sale or for use in any public eating place.

It provides for colouring up to 1 6/10 degrees of yellow, or of yellow and red collectively. This is a degree of colour which is being adopted in other jurisdictions outside of Canada, and which distinguishes it from butter, which varies from 3 to 5 degrees of colour; yet it does not produce a product which would be distasteful to the consumer in appearance.

It also provides that every package shall have marked thereon "oleomargarine" or other trade name by which the particular product is known, also that it is a substitute for butter, and a list of the ingredients, as well as the percentage of each, shall be inscribed upon the package.

The regulations under this Act will provide for the issuance of licenses to manufacturers which will prescribe all the regulations and will also prescribe standards of quality with respect to moisture content, et cetera.

I might say for the information of the House that it has been found that some margarine which has already been placed on the market has been found to have a moisture content as high as 30 per cent. We felt that moisture content should be set by regulations. As no doubt a great many hon. members are aware, the present moisture content as permitted under The Dairy Standards Act is 16 per cent.

It is the hope of this government that this bill will regulate the manufacture and sale of this product in an orderly way, and that the Federal Government in due course will assume their responsibilities both to the consumers of this product and to the producers of dairy products, by introducing legislation which will put into effect uniform regulations applicable to all the provinces in Canada, since we feel it is the only proper manner in which the handling of this product can be carried out in order to avoid misunderstanding between the provinces, and in the public interests of all concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I may say that last night we adjourned at 6 o'clock because we had made such good progress with business, and so many hon. members wanted to hear the early reports of the Dominion Budget, we thought it was only humane that we should do that.

A few days ago I had some comments to make in connection with the Dominion Budget and made certain forecasts, some of which are borne out, and others which I still prophesy will be borne out within a few days when the hon. Minister of Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) at Ottawa gets "his crack" at things.

However, I should like to bring a very important matter to the attention of this House, Mr. Speaker. In bringing down his budget last night, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) announced:

> "With respect to income of corporations earned on and after January 1, 1949, the present rate of 30 per cent. shall be reduced to 10 per cent. on the first $10,000 of income—"

I may say I am not objecting to that, I think it is quite logical and proper; the fact of the matter is, it might have gone further than that. However, I am satisfied with that.

> "—and increased to 33 per cent. on incomes in excess of $10,000 with corresponding changes in the rates in the case of consolidation."

The proposed action of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott), Mr. Speaker, is in direct violation of the spirit of the dominion-provincial tax suspension agreement which was entered into by this government, and to which I referred in my budget address on at least two occasions. It is also in direct violation to the undertakings which were given to the provinces at the time of the Dominion-Provincial Conference. This affects particularly the non-agreeing provinces.

Section 20 Sub-section 1, of the Act which I have mentioned, which was passed unanimously by this Legislature in 1942, says this:

> "The Dominion shall have the sole right to levy taxes on personal and corporation incomes of the calendar year ending the 31st of December nearest to the date of the termination of this agreement and with respect to personal and corporation incomes for the following year, undertakes—"

Listen to this—

> "—to reduce its rates of taxes by such amount as will enable the province to again use the income and corporation tax fields; and, in particular, the dominion undertakes to reduce its rates of taxes on corporation incomes by at least 10 per cent. of such incomes."

Now, two years ago. in 1947, that was done. The dominion reduced their basic tax from 40 to 30 per cent., leaving the 10 per cent. field for this and other non-agreeing provinces. The result is now, that, while we have not occupied that field fully, we have occupied it to the extent of 7 per cent. There is still 3 per cent. of that field unoccupied by us. Now the dominion comes along, and in the case of the major companies, occupies that field to the extent of 3 per cent., bringing their tax up to 33 per cent. which, with our own tax of 7 per cent., makes the old rate of 40 per cent.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): It is your own fault.

MR. FROST: As I have said, according to its reports, the Dominion Government, in lieu of the other rate of 30 per cent., imposes corporation tax levies of 10 per cent. on profits up to $10,000, and 33 per cent. on the excess. While this amendment will give tax relief to small business, all corporations earning profits over $77,000 will now bear heavier corporation taxes than last year.

The following figures, based on the publication of the Department of National Revenue called "Tax Statistics, 1948," table (e) indicates:

> Provincial distribution of 23,166 active taxable companies reporting a profit classified by incomes taxed under the 1946 taxing year are as follows:
>
> The changes in corporation tax rate announced in the Abbott budget will have the following effects:
>
> 1. In all companies: the gain to the dominion on companies earning on the average more than $100,000 is $28,300,000; the loss to the dominion on companies earning on an average of less than $100,000 is $19,000,000; making a net gain of $8,500,000.

The $8,500,000 comes this way:

> Ontario companies: gain to the dominion on companies earning on an average of $100,000 and over is $13,100,000; the loss to the dominion on companies earning on an average less than $100,000, is $7,000,000; making a net gain to the dominion—

which comes out of the Province of Ontario and the other provinces—

> —$6,100,000.
>
> In the net result, the gain to the Dominion of Canada on their alleged tax reductions, which were made at the expense of the province, principally in revenue from corporations, in the amount of $8,500,000, will come mostly from Ontario. To be exact, Ontario corporations will be saddled with 71.8 per cent. of the increased taxation; and this government, that talks so much about "provincial

rights," further squeezes the province out of a tax field which by agreement was their own.

MR. MACLEOD: Did you not really squeeze yourself out?

MR. FROST: Just a moment.

All the figures for 1949 will not be exact to the cent. There is no doubt that the relationship between the two groups of companies with profits over and under the $77,000 will be almost identical. The hon. Minister of Finance's (Mr. Abbott) proposal will therefore involve the imposition of a tax exceeding 30 per cent. in 5/6 of the net taxable incomes of corporations in Ontario, and accordingly trespasses on the minimum corporation tax reduction to which the dominion solemnly agreed with this province in the 1942 tax suspension agreement, which was passed in good faith by this Legislature, and unanimously, in order to assist the dominion to go ahead with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I will just leave this with you, and will leave it to some of the gullible people, both inside and outside this Legislature, who ask us to enter into agreement with the dominion. Could any clearer indication be given to the people of this fine old province that solemn obligations entered into by the Dominion Government are sacred in so long as it suits their convenience only?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

MR. SPEAKER: A question?

MR. MACLEOD: Yes, a question.

MR. SPEAKER: No. No discussion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): No questions.

MR. FROST: We will be in Estimates this afternoon, and you can ask then.

MR. MACLEOD: Well, you really threw away $16,000,000.

MR. BLACKWELL: A breach of the rules.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Why do you not name him?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 72.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 72nd Order; House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I would again move the motion which was made yesterday.

Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that all the words of the motion after the word "that" be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

"This House should now deal with the provisions of Bill No. 135, 'An Act to amend The Executive Council Act'."

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker—

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Wait until it is put.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you, and I ask you to rule, that the bill in question is out of order on the basis of being a money bill, which can only be introduced by members of the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

MR. MacLEOD: Better start reading it over again.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, may I say to you that, before you make up your mind, you will have before you the ruling which says that a private member may move a motion at any time to reduce an item in the Estimates. Certainly they cannot move to increase an item, but my understanding of the rule is, and always has been, that any hon. member can move to reduce an item in the estimates. That is what we are doing.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, if I may direct your attention, and through you direct the attention of the House, to the actual considerations. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) is in error when he refers to this as being an item in the Estimates. What we are dealing with now is a bill which deals with money.

The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has put it on the basis that a member may move to reduce a vote in the Estimates, but not to increase it.

May I, Mr. Speaker, remind you and through you, the hon. members of the Legislature that we are not talking about an item which is a vote in the Estimates.

There is no reason and no necessity for any statutory items to appear in the Estimates placed before this Legislature. They are there merely for the convenience of hon. members so they may realize, as they are considering the Estimates, the combined effect of the statutory items and the items to be voted by the Legislature.

The fact of the matter is, as far as statutory items are concerned, they are voted at the time the bill receives third reading in this House and not at the time they appear in the Estimates.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think there are two things which ought to be taken into consideration.

The first is that the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) point of order is premature. The motion which has just been moved by the Leader of the Liberal Party, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), relates essentially to the Order Paper. It is, in substance, a motion that the House do not now go into a Committee of Supply but proceed with another item on the Order Paper. I think it should be open to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to raise his point of order at a later stage when a bill moved by my hon. friend for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) is before the House. However, this is most certainly premature because the motion moved by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) is as to procedure and not as to the disposition of a money bill itself.

Secondly, if the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) point of order is to be dealt with at this time, which I hold to be premature, then I notice he has not taken the trouble to refer to any precedent nor has he referred to any provisions of the Statute. There are a number of precedents regarding introduction of money bills into this House. I say, Mr. Speaker, that most certainly it is true that no private member can introduce a bill or resolution which has the effect of appropriating money. Not even a member of the government can do that without a message from the Lieutenant-Governor. However, there is no rule—and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has not mentioned one, nor has he mentioned any precedent—whereby a member cannot introduce a bill which has the effect of reducing public expenditures or reducing taxation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, one point more in regard to this matter. If we look at Arthur Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Rule 345, we find these words:

"The ancient doctrine that the redress of grievances should be con-

sidered before the grant of supplies is maintained in the House of Commons of Canada by the provision of Standing Order 49 that the motion for the Speaker to leave the Chair can be amended; and the amendments need not be relevant but may relate to every question connected with public administration."

That seems to be to be interpreted in this way, Mr. Speaker. In regard to an amendment to the motion to go into supply, we are not restricted by any narrow definition of what the motion should be. We are, more or less, as private members, the judges of the calibre and the character of the motion, because as Rule 345 says, specifically, it need not be related to the matter concerned. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in this regard we are proceeding in a proper and orderly manner. We have a bill before the House which suggests a change from $10,000 to $8,000, in regard to Cabinet Ministers' salaries. It is a matter of consistency that when we move into the Estimates, if we are going to be consistent, the first department that we come to that has the salary at $10,000 instead of $8,000, if we pass these Estimates without having first dealt with the bill, then it seems to me we are not proceeding in the proper manner.

This Motion is put before the House in order that we may proceed with the bill first, argue its merits and its demerits, if you will, of the order on the Order Paper; then, no matter how it is disposed of by the hon. members in this House, quite properly and in order and being consistent, we can come back to the Estimates and deal with them in a direct, sensible manner.

MR. SPEAKER: By some intuition, I was afraid this question might arise today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: I spent considerable time yesterday and this morning in trying to come to some conclusion. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) referred to Dr. Arthur Beauchesne. I fully recognize, Dr. Beauchesne as being an outstanding authority. Page 103 of the Rules and Orders of Procedure of this Legislative Assembly reads:

"(b) In all contingencies unprovided for the question shall be decided by the Speaker and in making such a ruling the Speaker shall base his decision on:

1. The Usages and Precedents of this Legislature.
2. The Rules, Usages, and Forms of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, as in force at the time."

I realize the authority of Dr. Beauchesne and recognize his being outstanding in his field but, according to our rules, we do refer back to the United Kingdom.

May I refer the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), to Rule 47 on page 113, so far as the right to determine the propriety of a motion is concerned. Rule 47 states:

"Whenever the Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the House is contrary to the Rules and Privileges of Parliament, he shall apprize the House thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon, and may quote the rule or authority applicable to the case."

I would like to say to all hon. members of the House, that I am not a lawyer in any sense of the word.

Rule 112 on page 129, reads as follows:

"(By the 54th Section of the Imperial Act, 30 Vict., c. 3, 'The British North America Act, 1867,' it is provided that the House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended by a message of the Lieutenant-Governor in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.)"

My interpretation of the bill is that it does affect a direct "charge" upon the people. Of course it is a reducing "charge," but it is a "charge." With that in mind I feel that the bill must be ruled out of order.

MR. OLIVER: And this motion out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion must be out of order.

MR. OLIVER: Without arguing it further I must say, with all respect, I am going to appeal against your ruling.

The House divided.

Ruling sustained on division.

AYES: 44
NAYS: 33

MR. SPEAKER: As a result the bill will be removed from the Order Paper.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order. Surely the motion that was introduced by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has nothing to do with the bill in question. How can the bill be removed from the Order Paper on the basis of your ruling that the motion was out of order? I think they are absolutely separate and apart. The bill has to be called.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be continually opposing you but this motion of mine asked that Bill No. 135, be considered by the House at this time before the various Estimates are called. This motion was defeated after an appeal from your ruling.

Mr. Speaker, I would like some information from somebody as to how that removes the parent from the Statute books even though the child may have been slapped.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: It seems to me it should not have anything to do with the bill on the Order Paper and I think we are entitled to some foundation for the suggestion that the defeat of one removes the other from the Order Paper.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, what the ruling was about was the bill—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no, no.

MR. JOLLIFFE: How could it be?

MR. LEAVENS: Play the game.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel the ruling was on the bill, in view of the fact that it was a money bill, and I ruled that the bill, being a money bill, under Rule 47, was out of order. Then I referred to Rule 112.

Certainly that ruling is on the bill, because it involves the expenditure of money. This is supported by May in exactly the same manner. If the bill had not mentioned money, it would have been a totally different thing, but it explicitly reads: "$8,000," not only the figures "8,000," but it refers to eight thousand one-dollar bills.

MR. BLACKWELL: May I finish what I was about to say, Mr. Speaker? I sat down while Mr. Speaker was on his feet.

That is precisely right, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I asked you to rule, and you have ruled the motion was out of order. That automatically creates a vacuum, and nobody but the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) would want to return to a vacuum.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of such importance I think it is proper you should hear, on a point of order, from hon. members. Deficient though our knowledge may be, I think it is important on a matter of this kind that there should be placed on the record the representations which may be made for and against the ruling, and on the question asked by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell).

I am very much surprised that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) who

is the principal law officer of the Crown should have got into so much confusion about the matter—

MR. BLACKWELL: I am arising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am speaking on a point of order, and I am entitled to complete what I have to say.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, the ruling by Mr. Speaker is not debatable. That is all I wanted to say.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The point is the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) moved a motion, and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) arose on a point of order against the motion.

MR. DOUCETT: You are all out of order.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He did not rise on a point of order against the bill, but on the only motion which was before you, Mr. Speaker, at that time, which was the motion by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver).

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) completed his point of order, and you ruled that it was well taken. The effect of the ruling was that motion by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) was ruled out of order, and could not be dealt with by the House. That was the effect of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, even though the reason you gave was having in mind the nature of the bill. It was not a ruling on the propriety of the motion by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) this afternoon, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, you cannot give a ruling on the propriety of the bill in question until it is called, and then the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) can rise if he wishes. I am amazed at the chief law officer of the Crown—

MR. MACLEOD: Why be amazed? He has been in a fog ever since the session began.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has the floor. Let us restore order.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not mind, Mr. Speaker. I think you are conducting these proceedings very well. But my hon. friends should appreciate that points of order are discussed at Ottawa, or at Westminister, and I respectfully submit you should hear any hon. member who wishes to make a representation with respect to the point of order.

I was very much surprised that the chief law officer of the Crown should get himself into such a state of confusion about two entirely different questions; the first being the motion moved this afternoon by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) cannot rise on a point of order against a bill, before the bill is before the House for consideration. At that time he will have probably another point of order and I suppose he may be fairly optimistic that he will receive a favorable ruling on that point of order.

Let us not get so confused as between two entirely different things.

MR. SPEAKER: I am still of opinion—and you may also want a division on this—that my remarks centred themselves around a money bill.

The first point was raised on a point of order and raised by the hon. member who introduced the bill. I think I answered the representation by referring to our own rules of procedure, as being based on the British system. I could have gone a little more thoroughly into it, and read an extract from May in regard to the matter. That part of the debate is concluded, and I based my ruling on rule 112.

With regard to the relevancy of the bill, as raised by the hon Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), I say again that, in my opinion, it was not a proper motion to be presented to this House. I am supported in that by Rule 112, because it had to do with public funds which had not been recommended to this House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

Certainly I cannot rule on a nebulous bill—just on a series of words. The bill itself deals with money, and when I

ruled it out of order, a division was taken and the ruling of the Speaker was sustained, my ruling being that the bill was out of order.

If a bill is out of order, it does not exist any more. That is a point of view I definitely take. It is just taken off the Order Paper. My contention is that the bill was not a proper one to be introduced, and in that I had the support of the majority of the House. In my opinion, therefore, the bill no longer exists.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, and on the ground that the bill has not been before the House at any time this afternoon, I am obliged to appeal from your second ruling.

MR. OLIVER: May I say this last word, Mr. Speaker? The motion I moved was this:

> "That the House should now deal with the provisions of Bill No. 135."

The House decided—perhaps in a round-about way, that it would not now deal with Bill No. 135, but it did not decide, by the longest stretch of the imagination, that it would never deal with Bill No. 135.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Surely there is a line of distinction to be drawn there somewhere.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (CCF Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, may I say just one word? We accepted the amendment moved by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), and it seems to me the proper procedure would be to call the bill, and then rule it out of order. A matter of procedure is always in order. It seems to me the thing for us to have done would have been to accept the amendment, call the bill, and then it was up to the government to suggest it was out of order.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am appealing against the second ruling of Mr. Speaker, namely, that the bill itself must be removed from the order paper, on the ground that it is a money bill.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: That is not debatable.

MR. DENNISON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest that you defer your ruling on the bill itself till such time as the hon. member moves the bill.

MR. BLACKWELL: No.

MR. DENNISON: My opinion is that the bill, not having been duly moved and seconded, is not before the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest you defer your ruling—you have indicated what it will be—and I further suggest it would be in order to defer your ruling until such time as the bill is moved and seconded in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: An appeal has been taken against the ruling of the Speaker. That must come before the House, before anything else.

Call in the members.

The House divided.

Mr. Speaker's ruling negatived on division.

YEAS: 33
NAYS: 45

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

MR. OLIVER: No, I cannot allow the motion to carry yet. I want to further protest, by dividing the House on the motion itself.

MR. FROST: On the same vote?

MR. OLIVER: Oh, no.

MR. NIXON: You people like to vote. You called for a division on a unanimous vote yesterday.

MR. FROST: We wanted to be sure it would be unanimous.

MR. McEWING: You will not get the hog subsidy anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The House divided.

Motion agreed to on division.

AYES: 45
NAYS: 33

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

MR. FROST: Treasury Department, page 89.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I desire to make to the Committee of the Whole House a statement relative to the item marked "Statutory" under "Order, Main Office," Minister's salary, $10,000, and, Mr. Chairman, in making that statement I want to express regrets at the illness of the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) which prevents him from making a statement himself today on this matter. His painful and quite serious illness has delayed consideration of the matter. I have, however, been able to discuss it with him at his home and also with my colleagues. The statement I am about to make represents the views of all of the members of the Executive Council.

In the year 1924—that is 25 years ago now—the Ministers' salaries were placed by statute at $8,000 a year, and they so remained until the session of 1930, when they were increased to $10,000 effective from the commencement of the official year, which then started November 1, 1929. I believe Mr. Ferguson, who was then Premier prior to the election of 1929, had stated—that is, after the election of a new Legislature —the above rates would apply, and accordingly after the election of 1929 the salaries of the members of The Executive Council were increased. Following this, in the days of the depression, the Premier—then the hon. Mr. Henry —proposed and put into effect a decrease of 25 per cent. on salary—20 per cent. of the salaries of members of the Council, and 10 per cent. in the case of private members. Subsequently the matter resolved itself in the members of the Executive Council voluntarily reducing their salaries from the statutory amount of $10,000 to $8,000, and there the amount has remained since that time. The statutory provision of the Executive Council Act remains at $10,000. The practice has been for the premiers to write a letter to the Provincial Department directing that the provisions of the statute be disregarded and that the sum of $8,000 be paid, instead of $10,000, which is the statutory amount. When the present Premier assumed his office in October, 1948, he objected to this procedure on the ground that it was contrary to the Statute and contrary to the needs of the day insofar as the members of the Council were concerned.

However, he instructed the provincial auditor to continue the rate of $8,000 a year until the end of the fiscal year, that is, March 31st of this year, in order that he might place the matter before the House, and he gave instructions there should be placed in the Estimates an amount which was prescribed by statute.

The hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) had intended, but for his illness, to place before the House, a statement on the actual situation. It is true, the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) was in the House when the agricultural Estimates were passed, but at that time he was in very ill health—the forerunner of his illness—and he felt unable to do it on that day. However, he had intended to do it the next day.

The population in 1925 was a little over 3,000,000, whereas it now approaches 4,500,000. The revenues of the province at that time were approximately $35,000,000, whereas now they are in excess of $200,000,000. It may be said the work and responsibility of members of council has increased accordingly. The members by virtue of their position, are called upon to do, in the course of their public duties, far beyond the commitments which they would be called upon to make in ordinary civilian, or private, life.

In the meantime, exceedingly heavy income taxes have been imposed and the

members of council are allowed no deductions for expenses which are necessarily incurred by them.

I should mention that what I am about to discuss is well known to the older members of the House, but it is not known to the younger members, therefore, I should like to emphasize some of these points so hon. members may clearly understand the position, because I want to place before the House and the people of the province the situation which exists in relation to this matter.

No deductions for expenses are allowed to members of the Executive Council for expenses which are necessarily incurred by them. For out-of-town members, the situation is roughly this, that they are called upon to live in Toronto, yet of necessity they maintain their homes in their own home communities. A room in one of the local hotels costs a member approximately $1,300 a year, and even with the most reasonable type of living, it costs an outside member at least $3,000 a year to live in Toronto. I am not giving most hon. members opposite any news when I say that.

From the remaining $5,000, therefore, of the salary of $8,000, a minister must first pay his income tax on the whole sum of $8,000, there being no deduction for his expenses in Toronto; from what is left, he maintains himself and his family and carries out his personal obligations. It is true that each member is allowed a sessional indemnity, the same as any private member, but hon. members of the House know this indemnity—and I am not telling anything that is unknown here—is very largely consumed by the very heavy expenses and duties which any hon. member must meet in looking after a riding in these days. It is fair to state that a member of the Executive Council must, in addition on the $2,000 of indemnity, which is taxable, pay this amount without any allowance for expenses on that item whatever.

In the case of hon. members residing in the city, their commitments are just as trying owing to the fact that a major part of the social obligations which accrue to a government fall upon them because their homes are in the city. The result is the financial position of hon. members of the council is exceedingly difficult unless they have personal sources of income, which of course should not be taken into consideration in matters of this sort.

I think it is proper to say that in a democracy service on the Executive Council should not be limited to those who can afford to serve, but should extend to those who are best qualified, regardless of what their financial position may be. I think hon. members will agree with that.

What I have stated is the background of the hon. Premier's (Mr. Kennedy) feelings that the clear provisions of the statute should be complied with and that this matter should be placed before the Legislature in the Estimates. What I have said is not by any means due to hon. members of the House. Quite obviously, salary scales arrived at in 1924 can have no relation to conditions in 1949. The time must always arise when these needs must be reconsidered. In the British Parliament, it has been recognized that these matters are important, but I can assure hon. members of the House these matters are extremely delicate for a member of a council who is faced with the situation of today—and not only the situation of today, but the situation which confronted this House two years ago, when the salaries of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and hon. members of the House and other officials of the House were reviewed.

The hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) recognized this and for that reason gave directions that the reduced salaries should be paid until the matter could be placed in the Estimates, and he did so, Mr. Chairman, with the feeling that the matter would receive the calm and impartial consideration of hon. members of this House, the same consideration which a matter of this importance deserves. The problem affects not only the members of this Executive Council, but subsequent members.

Upon the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy), however, introducing his own Estimates in the Department of Agriculture, it became quite apparent that the attitude of certain hon. members was quite different from that which he felt would be the case. I shall refer in a moment to the consideration which the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and others received in the salary revisions of 1947, in which embarrassment, particularly to the then Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) was carefully avoided—I may say, Mr. Chairman, scrupulously avoided; everything which might have caused embarrassment was left out of the picture, so that the matter could be dealt with on its merits, recognizing that he was not the only Leader of the Opposition, that there might be another one some day, and, true enough, we have another one.

The hon. Premier, with every justification, felt that the problem we are now dealing with would receive impartial consideration. In the present instance, very derogatory references were immediately made by certain hon. members of the opposition to the action of the government. Improper motives were imputed, terms such as "outrageous" were applied. Liberals and Communists turned from this chamber to the radio to distort the picture, and to make the handling of the question difficult, if not impossible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Communists?"

MR. FROST: The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) immediately prejudged the matter by introducing a bill which would have reduced the statutory salaries of members of the council from $10,000 to $8,000. He immediately prejudged the matter instead of—

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): On that point—

MR. FROST: Just a minute.

MR. OLIVER: All right.

MR. FROST: You may ask questions when I am through. In fact, it became quite apparent that the opposition intended to use every conceivable method of impugning the good faith of members of this government. That was intended.

This attitude has left the members of the council under no illusion. While there might be some pious expressions from certain hon. members of the opposition to the contrary, nevertheless a vendetta would be carried to the bitter end, with a view to distorting the true picture and presenting a picture to the people of Ontario which was entirely unwarranted.

In my own case, for six years I have carried two portfolios, and may I say this, Mr. Speaker, it is with some embarrassment I refer to my own particular position in the case, but in view of the fact that all our good faith has been impugned, perhaps I may be excused for speaking about personal matters; for six years I have carried two portfolios. I have heard it said that I receive two salaries. Such is not the case. I have received the salary from one department only. The fact is, the province has been saved the salary of $10,000 a year in one portfolio and I have voluntarily taken a reduction of $2,000 a year in the other, which, over a period of six years, would make a saving on that basis of over $70,000 to the people of this province.

A number of other hon. members have also carried two portfolios and have served under similar conditions, while all the remaining hon. members of the council have taken a voluntary reduction of $2,000 a year on the salaries to which, by a vote of this House and by a statute of this province, they are entitled. Mr. Chairman, I am merely stating a fact, and of this fact hon. members of this council are not complaining; they are glad to have been able to do it.

In view of what has taken place, we are quite satisfied that the Ministry will be faced with unscrupulous attempts to misrepresent its position. The Ministry and its supporters will be faced with

arguing such matters as this on the hustings, when in fact it ought to be decided in this chamber, Mr. Chairman, with the dignity and consideration which befits a matter affecting this house and the dignity and independence of the hon. Ministers of this and subsequent governments.

When it is plain that an impartial consideration will not be given, no hon. member of this administration should be called upon to face indignity and insult in a matter which is going to affect not only themselves but subsequent members of the Executive Council. Certainly the atmosphere which the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) or any other reasonable person would have counted upon is not here.

In such circumstances, what should a government do? In such circumstances, what should hon. members of an Executive Council do, having regard to the dignity of this chamber, upon which the people of Ontario have a right to look for the completion in an orderly manner of its business; having a view to the dignity of the House, the financial problem of hon. ministers—any ministry, not only this one, but any ministry which occupies these benches, and the personal position of the hon. members of the present council in relation thereto?

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) immediately gave instructions about the situation which I have outlined. In his absence, the matter has been discussed by his colleagues. Illness prevents his making the statement which I am now making.

The position of hon. members of the council, those of us who sit here, was two-fold; first is the need and the actual justice of the situation, which obviously the opposition has planned to disregard; if any proof of that was wanted, it was apparent this afternoon in what took place, that hon. members of the opposition intended to obstruct and to embarrass and prevent this matter of having its proper, impartial consideration till "the last dog was hung"—that is what was intended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Sit down and take what is coming to you for a while.

MR. MACLEOD: Why did you not say earlier this afternoon what you were going to do now?

AN HON. MEMBER: Shut up.

MR. FROST: As I say, there is first the need and actual justice of the situation, which obviously the opposition had planned to disregard. The second was the unanimous desire of hon. members of the council to be meticulous in their dealings in public administration, and I do not think any government has ever been more meticulous in its dealings and in its relationships with the public than this government that sits right here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: The unanimous feeling of all hon. members of council was that they would prefer to serve at a loss to themselves rather than any misunderstanding, no matter how unfair it may be, should be cast upon them in the eyes of the public or of the great party which they are proud to serve and be members of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: They all felt it was a great duty and a great privilege to serve this province, and that financial considerations by them would be held purely secondary.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: With this background, hon. members of the Executive Council unanimously urged the hon. Premier to disregard the needs of the situation, the obvious needs and the unfairness of the situation, and expressed a desire to voluntarily reduce their statutory salary by $2,000, and accept the sum of $8,000, which they have done now for some six years. Accordingly, while the statutory sum of $10,000 has been placed in the Estimates, hon. members of the council

are accepting a voluntary reduction of $2,000, and will only draw the balance of $8,000. There will be written in the Estimates the words: "Voluntary reduction $2,000."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, at this point I think it may be properly said that two years ago the position of hon. members, Mr. Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition was considered. The then hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) has been most vociferous in this matter. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) had no compunction whatever in sitting on a committee and recommending a tax-free allowance of $2,000 for expenses should be added to his salary. I have the report here, which all hon. members may read. Later on, he had no compunction whatever in accepting this sum. The government recognized the delicacy of his position and confirmed the report in respect to the recommendation concerning him. Now, when hon. members of the Executive Council are voluntarily accepting salaries on the 1924 level, it provided the opportunity for the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) who apparently is "playing with the other boys" from the vote we see this afternoon, to reconsider his own position and when the Estimates concerning himself come up, and to determine the effect if his salary were to be reduced back to $1,500 level which applied in 1924, and his expense allowance was cut off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I am placing this statement on *Hansard* and I am distributing the same widely to the press in the hope that public understanding of the problem will induce an attitude in this House which will some day allow this important matter to be dealt with on its merits, devoid of partisan consideration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, before we go any further, I think it would be well if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would complete the record he has just been giving—and I think he may be willing to do it—by reading the letter which he tells us was given to the Provincial Auditor over a period of years by the hon. Premiers. I have never seen the text of that letter, and I think it ought to be put on record so that we will know just what we are talking about.

MR. FROST: Why do you not ask your "fellow-traveller" over here, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), because he signed one and knows all about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You are the one being asked.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I take it that it is in the possession of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) now. He referred to it earlier this afternoon.

MR. FROST: The letter is there and it can be produced at Public Accounts Committee, if you want it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is there any reason why it should not be read into the record?

MR. FROST: None whatever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Then let us have it.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Read it now.

MR. FROST: The situation is that the previous hon. Premiers asked the Provincial Auditor to disregard the statute and not pay the hon. members of the Executive Council $10,000, but to pay them $8,000. That has been done by Mr. Hepburn, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Conant, and by Mr. Drew, and Mr. Kennedy last fall asked the Provincial Auditor to continue it on to the present time.

I might say we are not asking the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) to do this for us, we are going to sign a letter

ourselves to the Provincial Auditor, asking him to voluntarily reduce our salaries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I know the letter has been reported to the House. It was explained by the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) when he introduced his own Estimates, and it has been explained again today by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). The reasonable question which I was putting was, is there any reason why we should not have the text of the letter. I have never seen it, and I am sure most hon. members of the House have not.

MR. PORTER: Would you like it as a model for your own?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I was just asking if there is any reason why it should not be read to this House?

MR. FROST: None whatever.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then let us have it. I am curious to know how it is, and I am speaking objectively about it, I am just curious to know how such a letter could have been composed with reference to what was specifically provided for in a statute. I am naturally curious about it. That is why I asked.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): That is the question, how it started.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is it going to be read or not?

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): May I ask, when Mr. Henry in the depression days reduced the salaries of himself and his ministers, did he instruct the Provincial Auditor then by letter that that was the amount to be paid? He certainly did not vary the statute.

MR. FROST: No, it was done the same way, done by letter.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Just the same way as Drury did it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am still asking if there is any reason why it cannot be read before this House.

MR. FROST: None whatever.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then will you read it now.

MR. FROST: You want me to go upstairs and get it?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, if it is not here—

MR. FROST: Certainly it is not. I do not run around with letters to the Provincial Auditor.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I was under the impression that it was, because the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) referred to it. I want to say something for the record also, and I hope to be able to discuss it more objectively and with less indignation than has been displayed this afternoon by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

MR. PORTER: And some of your colleagues.

MR. FROST: Some of your colleagues have done pretty well.

MR. PORTER: On the radio and elsewhere.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I wonder if it is possible—

MR. FROST: Did you listen to the radio?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think the hon. Ministers can point to anything which has been said by my colleagues that was in any way objectionable.

MR. PORTER: Not much that is not.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If they will stop jumping to conclusions, I will attempt to discuss the matter in an objective way before the hon. members of this House.

Reference was made in the previous debate on the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture by my hon. friend the member for York East (Miss Mac-

phail), who is not in her place at the moment, if hon. ministers would only take the trouble to look at exactly what she says, I think they will appreciate the point—

MR. FROST: My recollection is that she told us how "fat and sleek" we looked over here. If she was trying to be impartial—she was creating atmosphere.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is in error on that.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. JOLLIFFE: When heckled she may have got into an argument with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) but that is not the point.

MR. FROST: She was as cutting and as insulting as she could be.

MR. PORTER: She wrote a letter to her constituents. That was just as bad.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, we listened to the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) remarks without interruption, and I wonder if it is not possible for them to listen to what I say with the same attention we gave the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: They did not say it as badly as you did.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There it is again. It is strange that men who have had such a long experience in public life seem unable to accord someone else the same observance of the rules that they expect themselves.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (PC Minister without Portfolio): You come and go.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That kind of heckling, of course, contributes nothing to the discussion, and I still intend to say what I have to say about this matter. If the hon. Minister in charge of hydro affairs (Mr. Challies) will just pay attention, I think he will be able to appreciate what our position is. In the first place—

MR. BLACKWELL: If you would keep your mind on what you have to say, we could understand.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell).

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) never can keep quiet.

MR. BLACKWELL: If you could stay on a single track, he would be able to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is the difficulty? You cannot—

AN HON. MEMBER: You like to "give it" but you do not like to "take it."

MR. MACLEOD: He needs the insulin shock treatments.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go ahead and "take it."

MR. JOLLIFFE: I wonder if it does not—

AN HON. MEMBER: Go on with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is wasting time now?

MR. JOLLIFFE: This garrulousness which we have to take—

MR. PORTER: What about now?

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is another great message from the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

MR. BLACKWELL: Go on.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). Hon. members of the government are looking more and more like children every minute.

MR. PORTER: At least we do not look like whipped dogs now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I may say if, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) suggested, this matter should be discussed with dignity and restraint in the House, we are not getting a very good example from he and his colleagues this afternoon.

The first point I have to make is this; that I think the hon. members of this group agree with me that when the statute provided for $10,000 for Ministers, the proper thing to do was to make the payment as provided by the statute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We do not think there was any proper authority for the reduction which was made. It may have been that in the times and circumstances of that day, a reduction in the Cabinet Ministers' salaries was necessary, but we think if it was necessary it should have been done by way of amending the statute and I do not agree, and will never agree, with the suggestion that a mere letter from the Premier or anybody else to the Provincial Auditor is the proper way to go about reducing salaries, after those salaries have been fixed by the statute.

That is the first point on which I think there should be general agreement, as a matter of fact, what is the use of having a statute on the books if it is going to be dealt with in such casual fashion, whether it is desirable to make a reduction or not. Certainly, no one would suggest an increase could be made over and above the figure provided for by the statute; to say a reduction can be made without statutory authority seems to me all wrong. That is the reason I was suggesting the letter, which has been used all these years, ought to be produced. We ought to know what the text of the letter is.

The second point is that we agree with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that, if you will look at the population of the province and look at the revenues and expenditures of the province and if you keep in mind the fact that the $8,000 figure was fixed in 1924, and the $10,000 figure in 1930, having regard to the comparable figures in industry and commerce, the salaries in effect today are out of line. We agree with that and we have agreed with it all along.

The hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) said, when she spoke on this matter, that she did not suggest for a moment that Cabinet Ministers were overpaid. She did not believe any government employees were overpaid. She went on to say that for the Cabinet Ministers to accept a salary increase at this time, in a session where they have refused to provide more money for the old-age pensioners, was not a proper course to follow.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) feels it necessary—

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): He is laughing at the old-age pensioners.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am laughing at you. You have the funniest face I have ever seen.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It has been suggested on a good many occasions in the past and I have always thought it a sound suggestion, that in matters of this kind it should be referred to a committee of this House for study and the Legislature and the government should then await a report from the committee. As the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) said, two or three years ago when I was not a member of this House, the matter of hon. members salaries was referred to a committee. That committee made certain recommendations and reached agreement on a report but for some reason the government of the day did not accept entirely the recommendations of that report.

As the Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) pointed out a little earlier, the report did provide for a payment of hon. members on a new basis, it provided for some change in the remuneration of Mr. Speaker, it provided for increase in salary and expense allowance

for the Leader of the Opposition. These changes were written into the Legislative Assembly Act but they did not affect the salaries of Cabinet Ministers, except to the effect that Cabinet Ministers are also members of this House.

The salaries of Cabinet Ministers are provided for by the Executive Council Act and that Act was not amended. As far as I know, the Select Committee of 1947 did not report with relation to the Executive Council Act. The terms of reference did not include the matter of Cabinet Ministers' salaries. I think it would have been a better procedure to review the whole situation, including the Cabinet Ministers, through the work of a Select Committee. Then, if at all possible, to accept the findings of the committee and I still think it was not very sound to accept the findings of the 1947 committee in part and to reject other parts.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) saw fit to refer to the fact that because of the committee's report in 1947, the salary and expense allowance for the Leader of the Opposition was substantially increased. I am well aware of the fact that it was increased considerably, more than any hon. member in the House.

MR. FROST: And he sat on the committee and made the recommendation himself and took the money and nobody treated him like a "blackguard" but he does not like doing that to other people.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not discussing that right now, but I think what is clear is this: It would have been fair and preferable and, I think hon. members of the government will agree for the moment, better to deal with the whole matter at that time.

Furthermore, since certain criticisms have been directed at me this afternoon, I think it might be made clear to remove any misunderstanding, that I was not in the House at that time, although I agreed with what was done and I am not quarrelling with it. As far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, his expenditures are allowed for in the Legislative Assembly Act and not in the Executive Council Act.

MR. FROST: Do you think Cabinet Ministers should have $10,000?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do I think they should have $10,000? I will say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that this matter has been discussed by hon. members in this group and, having regard to the responsibilities carried by the hon. members of the government at the present time, and to the standards of remuneration in commerce and industry, we have come to the conclusion that $10,000 for hon. members of the Executive Council at the present time would not be an excessive salary. However, we also think it is difficult for the public or anyone else to understand that a change in that remuneration should be made at the present time. As I have pointed out before, this should not be done at a time when no increased provision is being made for people who are in great need.

MR. FROST: May I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) if he infers that this government should turn around and bribe the public by paying a lot of money and then raise our own salaries?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I do not. What I am inferring is this, that the Treasury of the Province of Ontario should look around and see the situation for which the need exists. As we have pointed out repeatedly at this session, there is a great and urgent and pressing need for increased provision for the old-age pensioners of this province. I tried to tell the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) the other night—

MR. FROST: I can only say that the position of the Executive Council is that the salaries which they receive are to be a matter of impartial consideration and determination by the hon. members of this House, divorced from everything else. The independence of this Parliament and hon. members of the Executive Council and hon. members

is not to be affected by the fact that they are called upon to do something else in order to get salaries. That is bad business and we will have nothing to do with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It looks as though I will have to explain the matter more clearly and with greater simplicity. I tried to tell the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) the other day and I am still trying to say to him with utmost sincerity and good faith, that today you are actually paying old-age pensioners of the province less money in purchasing power in terms of a real dollar, than you were two or three years ago. I am well aware of the fact that the same is true of Cabinet Ministers or any civil servant. They may be on the same rate as they were two or three years ago and they are compensated through the bonus for increases in the cost of living. So that I might make it doubly clear, let me put it this way. In terms of the real dollar you are paying Cabinet Ministers less than you were paying two or three years ago; in terms of real money you are paying old-age pensioners less than you were two or three years ago.

We think situations like that should be remedied but we say the need of old-age pensioners and others is more pressing, and more urgent than the needs of Cabinet Ministers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want any hon. member of the government saying I have suggested at any time that Cabinet Ministers, civil servants or anybody else should be paid less than they are worth. In my opinion Cabinet Ministers, at prevailing rates in industry and commerce, are worth more than $8,000.

MR. FROST: May I say this to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that his attitude has been quite fair.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I try to be.

MR. FROST: I think he has been much more gentlemanly—

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not a question of being gentlemanly, it is a question of being rational.

MR. FROST: — However, he has been sitting with hon. members in his group, who have not hesitated to go out and speak about what has been going on and putting it in a very bad light.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There are many things the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has said this afternoon to which I could take exception.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): What?

MR. BLACKWELL: Name one.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We will come to that later. I do not know why hon. members of the Cabinet are so anxious I should not make this statement.

MR. PORTER: Get on with it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then why all this heckling?

MR. PORTER: You are doing swell.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. members of the government are placing themselves in a very unfortunate position. They came to this House with Estimates for $10,000, instead of $8,000. Now, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) says I am trying to be fair. Well, I always try to be fair but I am not trying to be gentlemanly about it. I am trying to be rational and I will point out the merits of both sides and the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) usual boyish sense of humour—

MR. BLACKWELL: That is better than none at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have never known anybody in my experience, Mr. Chairman, who found his own jokes so uproariously funny.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Except some of your own followers, about yours.

MR. BLACKWELL: Your own cheering section does well for you.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) suggests that I have no sense of humour, I will soon get one sitting and watching him shake with mirth at his own masterpieces of wit. I am learning to go along.

MR. PORTER: Good. It takes a long time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But I cannot say the same of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is nothing witty about his interjections.

MR. PORTER: Uproarious.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What the hon. Ministers did, and this is to their credit, they did not accept an increase until such time as they came to the Legislature with the Estimates. Very well, that is commendable and certainly we would have had a great deal to complain about if a change had been made, as was rumoured in the press, without coming to the Legislature for authority. I suggest to the hon. Ministers that they are not facing the issue. They are putting themselves in a somewhat ridiculous light when they come to the Legislature and, finding, in their view, certain criticisms are being made, they are once again surrendering. They are once again in full retreat.

I do not think that is the way to face up—

MR. PORTER: Not at all. You are on the defensive. You have never been so much on the defensive as you are this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I say if in the view of the members of the executive council, their salaries should be increased, then they should tell us so, and instead of running away, they should take the proper action and stand by their decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: What is the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) applauding about?

MR. JOLLIFFE: If they think the old-age pensioners and other recipients of assistance from this government are more in need of assistance now, they should deal with those people first, instead of running away from it with nebulous predictions about what Hon. Mr. Abbott is going to do in Ottawa.

MR. FROST: I will agree with you he is very nebulous.

MR. DUNBAR: I want to ask a question. When you talk about the Abbott budget, did you not state the other night that the United Church was waiting to see what the action of the Federal Government would be in regard to old-age pensions, before they put through their own superannuation?

MR. FROST: It is all right for him to argue that, but nobody else should.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What I referred to, Mr. Chairman, was the fact that in 1945 the Dominion Government made certain proposals about which we have all heard, and part of these proposals involved old-age pensions, without a means test for everybody over 70 years of age.

It is an unfortunate thing—and I am not blaming the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) because it happened—that there has been so much talk and so much speculation, and so much forecasting as to what might be done by Ottawa as the result of those proposals in 1945, that many organizations have postponed the action they ought to have taken with regard to their pensioners, and I mentioned the United Church of Canada as an example, because when it was found their pensions were inadequate, instead of being able to act promptly, they

postponed action in the belief on the part of some people that old-age pensions were going to be made universal, without a means test. I am making that statement, and if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) does not agree with me, I will be glad to hear any evidence he has to the contrary.

MR. CHALLIES: They did not make statements of that kind when they were collecting funds from people like myself. I resent that statement, and a lot of others will too.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not saying they went about advertising it, but I am saying to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) this, that I think they would have increased their allowance, or improved the cost-of-living allowance earlier—

MR. CHALLIES: If you say they did not advertise it, they must have been doing it in the dark, and that is a double resentment.

MR. FROST: How would it be if we brought the United Church before the Public Accounts Committee, to find out what they did with the money they got from all of us? I made certain contributions, too. If you people say they did not do right, let us examine them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) asked a question about something I mentioned the other day, and I was endeavouring to explain to him what the reference was about.

MR. BLACKWELL: Now we have it. You should not have said it at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is another attempt at making jokes. Mr. Speaker, this session is reaching its seventh week, and I suppose the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will say it is much too late to refer matters of this kind to a committee. What I was pointing out is the government has had to retreat on so many matters this session, I would have thought they would have faced this with much more vigour than they have done.

I will say this to the Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues on the treasury benches—and I say it because I think it is correct. I do not care whether they take comfort from it, or if anybody else takes umbrage at it—I think some of the criticisms that were levelled at the government in this connection were unfair. I think many of the other criticisms which were levelled at the government were entirely fair. I disassociate myself from those which I consider to be unfair, but I continue the criticism I put forward this afternoon, and it was the same as the criticism put forward by the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) the other day.

MR. BLACKWELL: I wonder with which you are identified? We would know then where you stand.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think that should be clear, even to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) from what I have said this afternoon. I think anything I have said this afternoon will fall into the category of what I think is fair, and what I have not said, you can put down as my considering it to be unfair, as far as I am concerned.

The plain fact of the matter is that this has been done in such a way, and under such circumstances, that the government feel they have to retire. I think in many ways that is unfortunate, and I do not care who knows these are my views, I think it is important, as the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) said, that people in government should be sufficiently well paid so they will be independent, and not have to rely on other sources of income, and not be embarrassed by having to maintain possibly a residence in Toronto, as well as the residence in the place from which they came.

MR. FROST: We were quite prepared, Mr. Chairman, to have this matter considered impartially and properly, but we were not prepared to have the names of the members of this government dragged through the political gutters in this province over it.

There was no intention on the part of the hon. members opposite to give this impartial consideration. I will say that my hon. friend—and I will take the expression he used—was gentlemanly in his remarks.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do not accuse me of being too gentlemanly.

MR. FROST: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) would have been disposed to consider this matter in an impartial manner, but I will say that many other hon. members of the opposition had no intention whatever of doing that. They intended to say nasty things, cutting things, embarrassing things, and to drag the good name of the members of this government in the dirt, all over this province.

MR. MacLEOD: I suppose you have never done anything like that in your life?

MR. JOLLIFFE: In all friendliness, may I say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that I doubt very much if anything was said which would have been one-half as strong as would have been said by some of his colleagues, had they been sitting over here this afternoon.

MR. FROST: If we say anything on this side of the House, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) must admit that he sat on the committee and raised his own expense allowance by $2,000. We tried to act in the best tradition of the British Houses of Parliament, and we tried at that time to take it he was acting in good faith. It seems to me the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) saw fit to criticize the members of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) is well able to speak for himself.

MR. FROST: He will have a lot of explaining to do. He took the money and put it in his pocket.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, what I am saying as directly and as clearly as I know how, to the government, is they should have faced this issue, and faced all the other issues involved in compensating the servants of this province by raising their salaries or increasing the cost of living bonus, instead of running away from them. If they will face those issues, they will find that we in this group will agree with them where we think we are doing the right thing, and will disagree where we think we are doing the wrong thing.

MR. FROST: I have never known my friend to think we did anything here which was right. That would be an utter impossibility.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, only the other day when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues found they had the unanimous support on second reading of a bill, they wanted to go to committee, what did they do? They showed their appreciation by wasting the time of the house, and wasting the taxpayers' money by having a unanimous division.

MR. FROST: How about the three divisions this afternoon?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am coming to that. What happened this afternoon is just another example of the difficulty you get into when, instead of facing an issue, you try to run away from it, by a round-about route.

MR. FROST: I thought we were pretty direct, myself.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You have established an unfortunate precedent this afternoon. For hundreds of years, the opposition members have advocated and moved for reductions in government expenditures. They have done that at Ottawa, they have done that at Westminster, and in many of the Provincial Legislatures. This afternoon, in order to get the government out of a hole, we were placed in the position where the government majority was used to uphold a ruling that we could not consider a motion to reduce a certain expenditure.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I regard that precedent as a most unfortunate one. When my friends are sitting over here, and we are sitting over there—

MR. DUNBAR: That is Hepburn's old story.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I say, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) is not so good at prophesying. He told us last week what was to be in Mr. Abbott's budget—

MR. FROST: No, I did not do so badly.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He predicted the income taxes would be reduced. Mr. Speaker, if there is anybody in this country who thought income taxes were not going to be reduced, yesterday, he should be in an institution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Why are you "faulting" me, for saying it, then?

MR. JOLLIFFE: What I am reminding the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) of is that there were other predictions that hon. Mr. Abbott would be "coming through" with a universal old age pension plan, but the hon. Mr. Abbott has not "come through." I suppose the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will now say, "Oh, it will be along in a few days now," or "next week," or "the week after that." This is being told to us, Mr. Speaker, solely because the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is evading the suggestions from here, and his own group, that he ought to do more for the old age pensioners in Ontario at the present time. It is again part of the old technique of delay, retreat and evasion which I say is unworthy of the government of this province.

My hon. friends went through an election last June and came back with a majority, and I cannot understand the timorous way they are conducting themselves at this session. I do not know why they do not face up to these issues and they would not become so worried every time the opposition raises criticism on what they think is slightly unfair. Why do they not face up to it and do what they think is right with regard to pensions? Why do they not face up to it and do what they think is right with regard to the salaries of the cabinet ministers? Let us not have any more self-righteous expressions about somebody over here trying to "play politics" when they know that in this Chamber how my friends would have made the welkin ring, if he had been sitting over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Well, I am here and you are over there.

MR. NIXON: You have been here before and you will be here again.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The way for a 40-per cent. government which wants the confidence of the people is to act vigorously, and to do what it thinks is right. It is entirely wrong for them to keep saying "The Cabinet Ministers should have more money, but we have not got the courage to go through with it." If it be the right thing to do, then I have no objection to them raising their own salaries, if they will only have the courage to face the issue.

MR. WELSH: That is collective bargaining; that is not individual bargaining.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) knows that the proposal resolves itself into this; if the Ministry are to accept his policies, and socialize Ontario, then he will agree to our having our salaries increased. May I say, that we cannot be bribed by anybody.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) can do better than that. I mean he should "pull up his sox," and can make a much better answer than he has made.

I will put it this way: never mind about the policies of the CCF, if the

hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will do as much as was done by a Liberal-Conservative Government in British Columbia, we will give him great credit for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If he will do as much as the Liberal - Conservative Government has done in Manitoba in the last two or three weeks—I will not say I will give him great credit for it, but I will certainly give him some credit.

MR. GOODFELLOW: The maximum in Manitoba is only $35. Last year they tried selling the municipalities on the idea of a five-dollar bonus, but the municipalities refused to take them up, and now they have a five-dollar bonus, with the same administration, as was used here in connection with a ten-dollar bonus.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Surely no one is misled about these maximums. We know that the maximum is $40 in Ontario, and that a few people have qualified for the maximum.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Thousands of them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That does not even begin to compensate these people for their loss in depreciated dollars in the last few years. You cannot get away from the fact that you are not paying the vast majority of these pensioners in the same money that you did several years ago. Why not face up to it? Why not do as well as the four western provinces are doing?

MR. FROST: This has been a start. We are not going to do anything for the sake of being paid larger salaries. We are doing our best, and are using our best judgment, and the salary question has nothing whatever to do with it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, just to show you how much the hon. Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) logic is worth. I say to him, "If you do as well as British Columbia does and if you do as well as Manitoba does, all will be well," but he sits back and says his Ministry cannot be bribed. What sense or logic is there in that? We ask him to do as well as other governments, and he answers that he cannot be bribed.

MR. FROST: You say if we do certain things, you will withdraw your opposition, so we can get $10,000 a year. We are not for sale.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am just telling you to do the right thing for yourselves, and for others, as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And have the courage to do what you think is right, in both cases, instead of making self-righteous speeches here, and trying to explain your ignominious retreat this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker—

MR. FROST: Are you going to give us back the $2,000?

MR. OLIVER: You just be quiet. I did not say a word when you were speaking, and surely, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) will agree that there should be some reciprocity in these matters, and I want to assure him I can talk just as loud and just as long as anybody on that side of the House.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, when this matter came up first in the Legislature it was on the Estimates of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Nixon) raised the point on the Estimate, as he had a proper right to do. I followed the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and gave my reasons as to why this matter should be more thoroughly discussed.

Quite apart from what my hon. friend said this afternoon (Mr. Frost) I did not use inflamatory language; I did not seek to engender—

MR. FROST: May I ask my friend a question? Have you made a speech over the radio, and, if so, will you read it to the House?

MR. OLIVER: I made a speech over the radio, and I will make another one, and I will say whatever I like over the radio.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: That will be your trouble.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, my points in relation to the question were three in number. I said, in the first place, that I thought the timing of this matter was very bad. I felt it should have been accomplished, if it was to be accomplished, in 1947, when the revision in the salaries of hon. members of the House, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, and others, were re-adjusted in the light of conditions at that time. Now, if the Cabinet Ministers should have the extra $2,000 in 1949 they should have had that extra $2,000 in 1947. I say—and I do not want any spontaneous mutterings from my hon. friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). I say that is a perfectly logical suggestion.

MR. DUNBAR: If it was right in 1947, then it's right in 1949.

MR. OLIVER: The whole matter should have been discussed at that time—

MR. DUNBAR: When you got yours.

MR. OLIVER: They should have advised us at that time—

MR. DUNBAR: When you got yours. You were no money out.

MR. OLIVER: Well, my hon. friends are really in a turmoil this afternoon. I do not wonder at that; it is just a continuation of the turmoil they have been in for days, and a turmoil which will go on and on, and the culmination will be the whole, complete annihilation of the party in the days that lie ahead. You are disorganized, within your own ranks, and you are completely out of tune, one with another, and you get up and move something one day, and then get up the next day and take it all away and say, "I did not mean to do it; please let me be excused, I will take it back and have it re-vamped and have the provisions re-vamped." Do not talk to me about consistency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: And do not talk to me, Mr. Hon. Minister of Light, Heat and Power (Mr. Challies); you did not have much to say when the lights went out in Ontario last year. The only things you say are things that people do not understand, and you do not understand them yourself. Yet you take the opportunity to shout something across the floor of this House. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that the effervescent outpourings of my friend from Ottawa, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) are a delight to see. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Dunbar) said the other day that I said somewhere I would like to see the farm, if certain things did not happen. I say "yes"; I would like to see the farm at any time—

MR. DOUCETT: You are going back to it.

MR. FROST: You are on the way right now.

MR. OLIVER: That is but another thing you are guessing about. If you think you are going to get more glory out of guessing in that way than you did in guessing about bringing down pensions in the Federal Budget, you are wrong—you are a long way out. That is all I want to say.

MR. DUNBAR: And Colin Campbell for leader.

MR. OLIVER: I want to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) that after I have looked at his face from Monday morn-

ing to Friday night, there is no place that I can find greater solace than on the farm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: My hon. friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) can take that as a compliment. He would be the first one to object if I did not pay him a compliment, and I do want to pay it, in all fairness to my genial friend from Ottawa (Mr. Dunbar).

MR. DUNBAR: You are the greatest cut throat in this country. I would not walk down the street with you. You would jab a fellow in the heart.

MR. FROST: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could pass the Treasury Estimate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. OLIVER: What I would like to say is this—

THE CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. members to stop this sort of talk, and give the floor to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver).

MR. OLIVER: You can either give me a hearing in the ordinary sense, or in some other way, I do not care which. I have a few things to say, and I want to say them.

There is this matter which was discussed this afternoon. My friend, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) brought up this matter. He said when this matter was first broached it was decided it would not become operative until the Legislature met, and then it would be put in the Estimate.

What I want to suggest to the House is this: The purpose of putting that or anything else in the Estimate, is that it gives the hon. members of the House an opportunity to discuss these particular matters.

When this matter first came up, I wanted to object to $10,000 going in to the Estimate for the Department of Agriculture, and my hon. friend the Premier (Mr. Kennedy) said "bring in a bill." Well, we did bring in a bill, according to the suggestion of my hon. friend, the Premier of this province (Mr. Kennedy).

MR. FROST: May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) a question?

MR. OLIVER: No, you cannot ask me any questions, unless you do it over the top of my lungs.

We brought in a bill, according to the suggestion by the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) quite properly, and we wanted that bill to move forward in the ordinary course of the Legislature, and come up for second reading, and be debated on the floor of this House. My reasons for ever objecting to this $10,000 were set out rationally, and gentlemanly, when I spoke on this matter in the House.

I think I was referring, before the outburst took place—one was that it should have been rearranged back in 1947. The second was that we have gone over the top, so far as revenue and buoyancy of the Estimates are concerned, and it would be setting, to a degree at least, a bad example to increase the Ministers' salaries at this particular time.

The third point I made was that we, in this House, at this time, had taken no positive action toward increasing the social services of this province, and as a consequence, it seems to me, we would be moving in the wrong direction without first taking into consideration the human needs of human families of the Province of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman—

MR. FROST: That is not what you said when you took the $2,000.

MR. OLIVER: I will spend a moment on that, if you wish. I think there were five or six on the committee—

MR. FROST: Yes, we would like to hear about it.

MR. OLIVER: Be quiet. You cannot hear anything if you are continually interrupting. This committee was composed of a majority of government members, and we were in agreement in regard to salaries, as far as the members and the various officers were concerned. They recommended that the salaries of the members be increased from $2,000 to $3,600, and I remember at the time they recommended that the salary for the office of the Leader of the Opposition, and for the office of Mr. Speaker, be increased. I do not think the increases which went to the office of the Leader of the Opposition nor to the Speaker of the House were out of line.

MR. FROST: You got the money.

MR. OLIVER: It so happened that I was the incumbent of the chair for the moment. If I had aspirations then to move in another direction, they were not realized in the course of time—

MR. FROST: You took the money.

MR. OLIVER: Oh, point to yourselves. The Chairman might say a word, if he could have the opportunity.

I do not think we need prolong this any further.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I see you are weakening. I think if I had a glass of water I would really down you this afternoon. We will let the matter stand where it is, as far as I am concerned. I have no regret about the whole situation. It was a proper subject for public discussion, and the government is afraid to bring the bill to the place where it could be discussed, on the floor of the Legislature. It is their responsibility, not ours, and they should do away with the manner of pre-judging the question, if anybody has.

MR. CHALLIES: Send your money back.

MR. OLIVER: Oh, send yours back. You never earned a cent in your life.

MR. DUNBAR: He bawls like a bull.

MR MACLEOD: Let us have a little protocol in this thing.

Mr. Chairman, we are discussing this particular matter on the initiative of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) who opened his Estimates with the remark that it was a matter over which the hon. members of this Legislature have little control.

MR. PORTER: Then why discuss it?

MR. MACLEOD: He opened the discussion. He started it, and we are therefore obliged to pursue this matter.

Now, I want to say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that the Pharisee of old who said, "Lord, I thank Thee that I am not as other men," will never be dead as long as you are alive. I never in my life listened to such a pitiful recitation of self-righteousness as we got from the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

MR. FROST: That is what you say about everything I do. I can never please you.

MR. MACLEOD: If he had yesterday or the day before given this House some intimation of what the government was going to say today, we would not have had to waste a whole afternoon.

MR. FROST: I just wanted to let it be clearly explained to the public what the opposition intended to do.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are imputing motives.

MR. FROST: I am not only imputing but I say you had those motives.

MR. MACLEOD: I want to say, so far as I am concerned, I think the hon. member of South Grey (Mr. Oliver)

and the other members of this House, did the very best they could in the circumstances, to bring this matter before the House in order to get that kind of dignified debate which the subject matter merits.

MR. FROST: Was not it before the House in another Estimate, which was raised by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), and I believe the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), when the Estimates of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) were before this Legislature and the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) informed the House that we did not have the right to change that figure until the Executive Council Act was amended and therefore the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) —who took it upon himself to bring in that amendment—did the only thing that he could do in the circumstances.

MR. MACLEOD: If the members on the Treasury benches had been manly enough to face up to this issue, you would have called that bill a day or two after it was given first reading and let the matter be discussed.

MR. FROST: May I ask the hon. member (MacLeod) a question? If we had allowed this to go forward, and the House had passed the Estimates, would my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) have gone down to Bellwoods and said, "Those people up there used their forces to increase their salaries by $2,000"? I see now that the hon. members opposite are in ambush. All yesterday afternoon they did not discuss one item in money-passing in very important measures that would affect the life of this province. They said nothing. They lay in ambush to get us down a dark alley to sandbag us.

MR. MACLEOD: Well, I must say that I consider that a rather feeble interjection. I do not see how that helps your case very much. This matter could have been discussed quite rationally and matters that come before this House of a contentious nature are always discussed much more rationally by the hon. members who sit over here than by those who sit over there.

MR. W. S. GEMMELL (PC Sudbury): That is your own opinion.

MR. MACLEOD: The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is the last man on earth who should stand in his place and try to teach other hon. members of this assembly lessons in dignity and deportment.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): We are not succeeding in teaching anybody anything.

MR. MACLEOD: I want to say, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of things said from that "Kraut Line" over there—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: —which you do not hear when you are on your feet. But if you take the trouble to read *Hansard* the following day, you really are shocked—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: —by the rudeness and the crudeness of the remarks made by some of the hon. members who sit in that row. For instance, if I may be personal for a moment, I was going through *Hansard* yesterday and was following the interjections and interruptions when I was making my speech, and what do you think I found? I found the distinguished hon. member for Ottawa, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) referring to "my ears," if you do not mind!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: That is a debate on a high level, it is not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Well, you launched a question.

MR. MacLEOD: He said: "Why don't you shake your other ear?" Now you are going to get it from me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: You referred to my age in 30 years: "What would he look like at 111?"

MR. MacLEOD: I did not say anything of the sort.

MR. DUNBAR: That is what you said, but you could not "take it" in return.

MR. MacLEOD: Just a nimute.

MR. DUNBAR: I said, "In 30 years from now your ears will be down around your feet."

MR. MacLEOD: Just a minute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. MacLEOD: Just a minute. I am going to say to you what I have to say if it takes me all afternoon. A remark was made over there that this government would probably be in power until 1990.

MR. FROST: That is right—about that.

MR. MacLEOD: And I simply made the observation—

MR. PORTER: We did not say the same personnel.

MR. MacLEOD: —if they stayed in power until 1990 with the present incumbents in office, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) would be 111.

MR. DUNBAR: You said: "What would he look like at 111?"

MR. MacLEOD: Just a minute. No, I did not.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, yes, you did.

MR. MacLEOD: No, I did not, but the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) said: "You will be a terrible looking—"

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. MacLEOD: "—specimen if you live to be that age."

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. MacLEOD: You are the man who said that.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, I said that in return for what you said.

MR. MacLEOD: I did not say it to you, although I am frank enough to say something was going through my mind at the moment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: If there is anything running through your mind, it is something new.

MR. MacLEOD: We have a picture in the House of what a person looks like at 70, and I do not want to live to be 111.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR: I say, if there is something running through your head, it is something new.

AN HON. MEMBER: Try it again.

MR. MacLEOD: The hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) a moment ago referred to my ears. I want to say when I came into this House six years ago my ears were quite normal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: However, after listening for six years for something intelligible from the lips of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), my ears stick out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: You will have to go to Russia to get something intelligible.

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman—

MR. MacLEOD: I do not think I want to listen to you.

MR. SCOTT (Peterboro): Cannot we get back to business? I am sick and tired of this foolishness.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, what you said, Harold.

MR. MacLEOD: I may say to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott), if he is sick of it—

MR. SCOTT (Peterboro): And tired of it.

MR. MacLEOD: Then he should go and have a few words with the people who started it. This debate began this afternoon with a prepared statement by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), who was allowed to proceed without any interruption whatsoever from this side of the House, and no sooner did the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) get on his feet than every hon. member in that Cabinet row launched into a series of ridiculous and stupid comments on the effort that he was making to present his case. You brought this on yourselves, and there is nothing to be gained by trying to wrap up a retreat in a package of self-righteousness.

You simply did not have the moral courage to stand up in your places and defend the thing which you believe to be right. That is the plain fact of the matter. You lack the moral courage to stand up in the Legislature and before the people of Ontario and defend and justify something which you believe rightly or wrongly to be the right course to follow.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): You are sore because you cannot agitate about it now, that is all.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a bright remark.

MR. MacLEOD: No, I am not "sore."

MR. FROST: Oh, no. There is nobody more disappointed than you.

MR. MacLEOD: You are—

MR. FROST: The wind has gone out of your balloon.

MR. MacLEOD: No, "the wind has not gone out of my balloon" as long as this government is in power.

MR. FROST: Then you will be flying for a long time.

MR. MacLEOD: I say your statement this afternoon does not do you much justice. If you sat down in the Council Chamber and spent some hours trying to devise means for getting out of the trap in which you placed yourselves, I think you could have come up with something better than this formula. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think the people of Ontario and certainly the hon. members of this Legislature can only arrive at one conclusion, that is, that the present Cabinet is lacking in moral courage.

MR. FROST: What would you have said if we had gone ahead?

MR. MacLEOD: I must add this—

MR. BLACKWELL: Give us the other speech.

MR. FROST: Yes, give us the other speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The other speech.

MR. PORTER: The other one was much better prepared than this one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. PORTER: This is impromptu.

MR. MacLEOD: The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), winding up on the Budget debate the other day, brought himself almost to the point of tears when he described the possibility of some old-age pensioners in this province getting a dollar or two or three

more than they were entitled to under the regulations. He spoke of these people in Lindsay who have . . .

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, let me ask this: What has this to do with the Treasury Report?

MR. MACLEOD: It has something to do with it, just as relevant . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nothing whatever to do with it.

MR. FROST: You will have your opportunity—

MR. H. WALTERS (CCF Bracondale): Don't interrupt.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no?

AN HON. MEMBER: They all do it.

MR. MACLEOD: I will be through in just a moment. If you keep quiet, I will be through.

MR. FROST: All right.

MR. MACLEOD: I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) made a proposal to this government this afternoon which merits careful consideration on the part of the government. It may be that if the Cabinet Ministers feel an injustice has been done them, if they feel they are not being properly compensated for the service they render the province, then they should give that matter to a committee of the supreme body of the Province of Ontario, The Legislature of this province. That is the proper way to deal with it. They should not wait, as they did, until after the ballots were counted in an election and try to push this through by their usual "steamroller" tactics.

MR. FROST: Are we getting the other speech now?

AN HON. MEMBER: It still holds good.

MR. MACLEOD: It still holds good. I think, having regard to the way in which you have handled it up to now, you should be thoroughly ashamed of yourselves, and I think you are. I think you are ashamed, deep down in your hearts.

MR. FROST: You all look pretty sheepish over there.

MR. MACLEOD: Yes, you do look pretty sheepish. You would be surprised how sheepish you look. If we could get that photographer from the fourth floor to come in and take a picture of you now, you would look pretty badly. Especially the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BLACKWELL: Why me?

MR. FROST: This is a private fight. You should not bother him.

MR. MACLEOD: I can only express regret that a government which claims so much virtue for itself, which claims so much strength, claims to enjoy the confidence of the people of Ontario, did not have the courage to stand up and defend themselves instead of making the cheap retreat they made this afternoon.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss item No. 146.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

On Item 146.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss No. 146. No. 146 still contains this item of $10,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to remind the hon. members of the government of this, which perhaps they have overlooked in their hurry to vote this afternoon to defeat the bill which the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) had before the House.

MR. BLACKWELL: How would you have voted on it?

MR. DENNISON: Let me ask a question of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). Had the bill introduced by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) passed, this item would have been reduced from $10,000 to $8,000, but the bill was ruled not in order, by Mr. Speaker, which leaves the members of this government, at the present time, in this position, that the Finance Minister, hon. Mr. Abbott, will ask them to pay income tax on the full $10,000.

MR. FROST: God forbid. Are you worried about that?

MR. DENNISON: You are only receiving $8,000, but you will have to pay income tax on the $10,000.

MR. FROST: We will all have to go to jail, like the poor jeweller at Renfrew, was it?

AN HON. MEMBER: And look what happened to him afterwards.

MR. DENNISON: I think it would have been better if you had followed the regular procedure of voting on the bill itself. Then you would not be in a position where they would tax you on an increase you did not receive—

MR. PORTER: You were all going to vote against the bill, according to your leader.

MR. LEAVENS: Oh, keep quiet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Quack, quack.

MR. DENNISON: We have heard a lot of talk from the government benches this afternoon about the position of the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) on this question. The hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) on this question stated in the House the other day that she did not think the members of the Cabinet were overpaid.

MR. FROST: She was not very nice about it, though.

MR. DENNISON: She said at one time she received an increase in the Federal House, but would only accept part of the amount, because she objected to the increase. She stated had she to do it over again, she would have accepted her salary in full, as it was in the statute, because she had to pay income tax on the full amount.

I would have liked the Cabinet to have taken a different action, and not forced, by their vote, a ruling by Mr. Speaker into our rule book, the effect of which will limit future Legislatures in this province, from reducing any item in the budget. I think it should remain the privilege of the opposition to move reductions in the government's budget. I am very, very sorry about this action this afternoon, because the effect of it will be to limit the power of this Legislature. You have established a precedent which may be upset in the future, but which will stand for the lifetime of this government.

Now, let me deal with the item the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has for sinking fund purposes. He has an item of $5,626,200. The provincial stocks and debentures outstanding amount to some $566,857,500. My calculation in that respect is as follows: It will take you, using this present method of retiring, by using a statutory amount of $5,000,000 a year, somewhere around 94 years to retire the provincial debt of this province.

MR. FROST: Fifty years. You made a mistake in the decimal point.

MR. DENNISON: No, I am afraid it is 94.

MR. FROST: Well, I will figure that out tonight.

MR. DENNISON: The sinking fund should be at least as large as that of the municipal councils. I think the debt of this province, if increased or added to, or a new debt created and put on our books, should be subject to a system whereby that debt will be retired in forty years, regardless of who the treasurer is, or what government is in power.

I would like to see this whole process of retiring debt on a 40-year principle put on our statutes, and put in such a way that a government would be unable to juggle it around, and change it from year to year. It requires $23,000,000 interest every year, so the size of the debt results in a considerable amount of taxes which have to be levied on the people of this province, and I suggest it would be a good, businesslike procedure to have the 40-year limit put on for the retirement of the debt of the Province of Ontario.

MR. NIXON: I was going to ask the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) with respect to the grant of $20,000 to the Incorporated Racing Association, if there is any string to that, as to how it shall be used, or is it for the encouragement of breeding?

MR. FROST: Yes. We allow the Racing Association five per cent. on the estimated purses. They have to account to us for the money. We do not just give them $20,000. They would have to show us the amount of the purses, and that goes back to the farmers who breed the horses. It is for the purpose of attempting to improve the racing stock in the province. I may say that the tax receipts in this class of thing amount to around about $3,000,000 a year, and after a good deal of consideration, we felt we were justified in providing something which would go back to the actual breeders of the horses on the farms.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Chairman, on this vote the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) may have mentioned it while I was out for a drink of water, but I was wondering whether any consideration is being given to his relinquishing the dual posts of Provincial Treasurer and Minister of Mines. Perhaps I can defer that until we come to the Estimates of the Mines Department. In the meantime, I leave that with him.

MR. FROST: I may say that apparently my services as Minister of Mines, for one who did not know anything about it, seems to have been fairly satisfactory.

MR. MACLEOD: You are about to take on another post.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That will be three.

MR. MACLEOD: And I thought it would be unfair for you to be the hon. Premier, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and the hon. Minister of Mines.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I say that Mr. Cotnam has given me a note which says he is unable to locate Mr. Hepburn's letter, but he says it is identical to those which I have here.

I have here a letter dated August 27, 1943, which reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. Cotnam:

"Will you kindly pass a salary-list for Ministers of the Crown at the following amounts:

"Prime Minister and President of the Council, $11,995."

I do not know the reason for the uneven amount.

"Other Ministers having charge of a department, $8,000.

"Sincerely Yours,

"(signed) George Drew.

"Prime Minister."

There is a similar one here for Mr. Nixon, dated the 20th of May, 1943, in identical terms, and there is one on the 8th of December, 1942, signed by Mr. Conant.

MR. DOUCETT: Read them both.

MR. FROST: They are identical in wording. It says:

"Dear Mr. Cotnam:

Will you kindly pass salary-list for Ministers of the Crown at the following amounts:

Prime Minister, President of the Legislative Council, $11,995.

Other Ministers, having charge of a department, $8,000,

Sincerely yours,

(signed), H. C. Nixon."

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is a curious letter. It does not make any reference to a statute, or give any explanation.

MR. FROST: It was acted upon by all the Premiers since 1934. They have all done the same thing.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Does this not place the Auditor of the Province of Ontario in a rather peculiar position, in that he receives a letter from the Premier of the day which instructs him to do something which is contrary to the Statute? I was under the impression, the questions I put to the Provincial Auditor the other day, that he was not subject to any person, under the Statute.

MR. FROST: I may say this, that anybody who gives us money, we will take it.

MR. NIXON: Will my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) have a search made for a similar letter from the hon. Mr. Henry, when he first reduced the salaries by $2,000?

MR. FROST: That goes back a long way—a good many years now. It was before Mr. Cotnam's day. Mr. Cotnam is unable to find Mr. Hepburn's letter, but no doubt it is in the files.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost first brought these Estimate to the committee this afternoon, he made some reference about the "$10,000," and said some change was to be made in the Estimates.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, what we intend to do is this; on the official copy of the Estimate, which is in the custody of the Chairman, we will have written, "Voluntary reduction, $2,000," in each case. We will try to get from the hon. Mr. Abbott a release from paying income tax, on the ground that it is a charitable donation, and we will apply it to the sinking fund, which might reduce the time down to 89 years, instead of 90.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) why he is doing it in that way; writing into the Estimate the words "voluntary reduction"? That might be considered a bit of electioneering.

MR. FROST: We would never want to do that.

MR. PORTER: That is what it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: It occurs to me, in fairness to the Auditor, and in fairness to the government, and in fairness to the Legislature and the people of Ontario, it would be more proper to deal with this by just amending the Statute.

MR. FROST: I may say to my friend (Mr. MacLeod), after all, why should we not put this thing in its proper perspective to the people of Ontario? However, we have a Cabinet here which has voluntarily been taking a reduction in their annual salary, and has been doing so far the past six years. My friend surely would not deny us credit for that, nor would he deny my friends opposite taking credit for having done that, during the past few years. If we tried to change it, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) would vote against it, and it might defeat the government. We had better leave it alone.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Surely my friend is "missing the boat." What he should do is to amend the Act, by providing a figure of $50,000, and then writing under it "voluntary reduction, $42,000," and use that in his election literature.

MR. FROST: My friend is so smart in political tricks, and he learns so quickly, that we are away behind him.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I knew my friend (Mr. Frost) would think of it sooner or later, and I wanted to forestall him.

MR. MACLEOD: I was going to suggest that since the members of the government are so anxious to get credit

for a voluntary reduction, would not the credit accrue to them just as well if they did it in the proper manner, by amending the Statute, and they would still get the credit.

MR. FROST: I think we may leave it the way it is.

MR. MACLEOD: A little earlier you wanted to take the cash, and let the credit go.

MR. NIXON: I think that is a subversive statement.

MR. BROWN: I notice an item of $5,000 for "Dominion-Provincial Conference." Are we bold enough to prophesy there will be a conference in the near future?

MR. FROST: Hope springs eternal in the human breast.

MR. PORTER: There will be a change of government down there before long.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We are still on Vote 146. I understand you wanted to take a vote on 146 before rising. It is not suggested you go through all these other votes, before we rise?

MR. FROST: Could we not complete the Treasury Estimate?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No. There are other matters we would like to discuss in connection with the Estimates of the Treasury Department, and I think when he has heard us, he also would like to have them discussed.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise and report very little progress.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Vote 146 is carried?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us hold it off.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD: (LP Bellwoods): Could we hold over 146?

MR. FROST: Then we will have to report no progress.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): No, we can report progress.

MR. FROST: Night session tomorrow night.

MR. MACLEOD: You are sure about that?

MR. FROST: Bring along your sleeping bags. You will need them.

MR. MACLEOD: Are you sure?

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report a certain amount of progress, and begs leave to sit again, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment, will the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) indicate to the best of his ability, which is considerable, what the programme will be tomorrow afternoon and evening?

MR. FROST: Well, we would like to proceed with Estimates but we have some Government Orders here.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Not very many.

MR. FROST: No. We will deal with those if we can on third readings and then go to Estimates.

MR. NIXON: You will not discuss the margarine bill at all?

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): We would not like to hurry that.

MR. NIXON: It is all right with us.

MR. MACLEOD: You are not in much of a hurry to bring it in.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where did you come from?

MR. BLACKWELL: That is up to us. We do not want you to lie about us, that is all.

MR. MACLEOD: It is a long time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It will have to be printed first.

MR. FROST: It depends on the printer.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

Vol. III, No. 31

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Thursday, March 24, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 24, 1949

Mining Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, first reading..... 1213

Credit of Consolidated Revenue Fund, bill respecting, Mr. Frost, first reading.... 1213

Hydro-Electric Power Commission, Steeprock Iron Ore and so forth, bill respecting, Mr. Frost, first reading..... 1213

The Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, first reading..... 1215

The Adoption Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading..... 1215

Farm Products Grade and Sales Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, first reading 1216

Department of Travel and Publicity Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading.. 1216

Tourist Establishments, bill respecting, Mr. Cecile, first reading..... 1216

The Public Vehicles Act, 1949, introduced by Mr. Doucett, first reading..... 1217

Public and Commercial Vehicles Act, 1949, introduced by Mr. Doucett, first reading 1217

Resolution of Greetings to Newfoundland, Miss Macphail, agreed to..... 1219

Institute of Accredited Public Accountants of Ontario, bill to incorporate, Mr. Murdoch, bill withdrawn..... 1223

Township of East York, bill respecting, Miss Macphail, second reading..... 1226

City of Owen Sound, bill respecting, Mr. Phillips, second reading..... 1226

Township of Sandwich West, bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, second reading..... 1227

City of St. Catharines, bill respecting, Mr. Martin, second reading..... 1227

Motion to Resolve into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to..... 1227

The Fire Departments Act, 1949, introduced by Mr. Blackwell, bill reported..... 1227

The Police Act, 1949, introduced by Mr. Blackwell, bill reported..... 1228

Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, bill reported..... 1261

Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, bill reported..... 1261

Department of Municipal Affairs, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, bill reported..... 1261

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, bill reported..... 1261

Ontario Municipal Board, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, bill reported..... 1261

Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to..... 1261

Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Thomas (Ontario), second reading, negatived on division..... 1300

Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dowling, second reading, negatived on division..... 1311

Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Walker, second reading, negatived 1314

The Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Isley, second reading, negatived 1316

Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Fell, second reading, negatived 1325

Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to..... 1330

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1949.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock
Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

MINING TAX ACT

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (CCF Temiskaming): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) tell us what he is going to do with the Mining Tax Act?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this is an Act which brings the Mining Tax Act in line with our Corporation Tax Act, and will bring into the matter of the tax picture certain subsidies which are being paid by the Dominion Government relative to expenses by mining companies.

CREDIT OF CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that leave be given to introduce an Act intituled "An Act for Raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) explain?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which permits the province to borrow up to $100,000,000. The bill is routine in nature, and is passed each and every year. I had no anticipation that amount of money will be required, but it is desirable that there should be sufficient in the bill to meet such a situation.

We have this year maturities of around $24,000,000, and we have a difference between the capital payments in the budget and capital receipts, of somewhere around $49,000,000. Then we have, always subject to withdrawal—I know there is very, very little possibility of withdrawal—but neverthless, we have subject to withdrawal in the Province of Ontario Savings Office about $66,000,000. Therefore, while I am asking for powers to borrow up to $100,000,000, actually there are possibilities and contingencies there which amount to $139,000,000.

HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER COMMISSION, STEEPROCK IRON ORE AND SO FORTH

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: (PC Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I

beg to move, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, Steeprock Iron Ores Limited, Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company Limited, and His Majesty the King," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have an explanation of the purpose of this multiple bill we have now before us?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would not attempt to explain the vast complexities there are in this bill at the present time, beyond saying that these are as a result of very prolonged negotiations which I have had now for many months past with these concerns, and into which latterly the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has come.

For the information of the hon. members of the House who are and will be interested in this bill, I suggest they read the Steeprock Development Act of 1942, I think—or 1943—with the agreements which are appended to that Act.

Mr. Speaker, I know once the hon. members see that Act and those agreements, they will probably be thoroughly mystified.

The Act itself is comparatively simple, but the agreements which are appended to the Act are extremely involved. I think it would be better if the hon. members would wait for a complete explanation. In the meantime, the documents and the agreements and the Act itself which is now being introduced, are all fairly bulky, and it would take time to print it. I thought it was desirable that it be commenced at once, so that the text will be before the hon. members of the House.

However, to simplify the situation in order that the hon. members may appreciate just what the backgrounds of these very involved agreements are, I will give you just a little explanation which will be far from perfect.

Back about 21 years ago, I think in the year 1927, the then government gave to the Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Power Company certain water or power development rights on the Seine River, and as the result of those leases, the Ontario-Minnesota Company erected a dam at the head of what is known as Steeprock Lake. Subsequently it appeared, as the result of many explorations—and this will be an interesting subject for those who are interested in it—great bodies of high-grade hematite ore were discovered in the bottom of Steeprock Lake, and recently, as a result of immense engineering feats being accomplished, a portion of the dam was shut off and the water pumped out of the Lake. I would say that approximately $20,000,000 is in that project, either at the Steeprock or the lakehead, and as a result of these operations the water was re-routed from the Seine River down into a lake called Finlayson's Lake, or Clear Lake, and a new passageway was created to the Seine River by means of highly involved and technical engineering feats, so that you had the dam located on the Seine River by-passed by means of a new waterway which was created around, I think they call it, the west arm of the Steeprock Lake.

As a result of that, in order to accomplish what was desired, the Hepburn administration, back in 1943, made these agreements which provided that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission would provide at Steeprock 10,000 horsepower to the Ontario-Minnesota Company to replace the power they were deprived of by reason of the re-routing of the river. An agreement was also made at that time with the Steeprock Company under certain terms and conditions, which are highly involved, whereby the Hydro-Power Commission would be repaid for the power they had furnished, in other words, what might be termed "replacement power."

In the intervening six years, the properties at Steeprock look, instead of being a highly uncertain and doubtful

proposition, as if now they have the earmarks of having tremendous iron ore possibilities. At that time, the extent of the iron ore deposits up there was not known. I think my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Cox) will agree that today, after all the work that has been done there, the possibilities or the extent of that iron ore range is unknown.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose and effect of this Act is just to get out of the way, as well as we can, the development at the head of the lake, and it gives the Province of Ontario a free hand in the development of that great resource, and it also, in effect, cuts in half the replacement-power cost for the operating company, all of which I think is highly desirable.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. members have had the opportunity of looking over the complicated Acts in the statute of 1943, and these agreements, which have been introduced, and the bill which has been recited and named here, I would be glad on second reading to give a more detailed explanation of this very complicated matter.

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): Mr. Speaker, what the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) has said is certainly correct. May I ask what the implication was when he said this would obviate the necessity of development at the head of the lakes? The power we are getting there today mostly comes from the Thunder Bay District. He said it was not necessary to develop further power at the head of the lakes.

MR. FROST: I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker. My reference was to the head of the Steeprock Lake.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

HON. CHARLES DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Kelley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Is this the 75 per cent. provision?

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, the two sections of this Act are more or less basic to the administration and I think can be better discussed on second reading.

The third clause is that authority may be granted to the Workmen's Compensation Board to lengthen out the payments for education. I should explain, Mr. Speaker, that the Act now permits a child to be paid for up until it reaches the age of 16, but the Board has no authority to continue payments until 18 years of age, if the child exhibits any particular ability, and should be further continued in school.

The difficulty we have run into is that often at the age of 18 a child is still at school, and probably in the middle of the school season, and if payments were cut off right in the middle, the child has lost that year of study, and did not reach the standard which he or she may have attained, if they had continued attending school. We want authority to continue past 18 to the end of the school term.

Another section changes the basic rate of compensation from 66⅔ per cent. to a maximum rate of 75 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: We got it out of you finally.

MR. DALEY: And a further section provides the maximum rate of salary in respect of which compensation may be paid to be increased from $2,500 to $3,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

THE ADOPTION ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Public Welfare): Mr.

Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Adoption Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, this is just a re-draft of the Adoption Act, with the exception of the section which provides that any application for adoption of a person who appeared to be over the age of 21, had to secure the permission of the Minister before the matter was taken to the courts. By this amendment, it will not be necessary to get the consent of the Minister, but it does make provision for taking the adoption order to the court.

FARM PRODUCTS GRADE AND SALES ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Grade and Sales Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. T. H. ISLEY (CCF Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) give us a few leads on this bill?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, the amendments which have been made to this Act bring the Dominion carding and wool grading regulations into effect under this Act, which was not the case before.

DEPARTMENT OF TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY ACT

HON. L. P. CECILE (PC Minister of Travel and Publicity): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Department of Travel and Publicity Act, 1946," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (CCF Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) please explain the bill?

MR. CECILE: Mr. Speaker, one of the sections in this bill is in order to bring the practise with respect to the annual report in line with the reports by the Department of Travel and Publicity with the practise established in the department of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Porter).

One of the things in this bill, which I will explain further on second reading, is that we have named the establishments which will be able to advertise themselves as giving information to tourists, and have designated these particular agencies or bureaux which will be able to give that information.

TOURIST ESTABLISHMENTS

HON. L. P. CECILE (PC Minister of Travel and Publicity): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act respecting Tourist Establishments," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) please give a short explanation of the bill.

MR. CECILE: Mr. Speaker, under this Act, it amends the former Act, intituled "The Tourist Camp Regulation Act." I shall attempt to explain this Act at greater length on second reading, but at this time I simply wish to say that this bill in particular is practically the same as the other one, except that it extends the scope of the Act taking into

account the tourist establishments which we consider as being in the business of tourists.

THE PUBLIC VEHICLES ACT, 1949

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Kelley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "The Public Vehicles Act, 1949," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PUBLIC AND COMMERCIAL VEHICLES ACT, 1949

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "The Public Commercial Vehicles Act, 1949," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) please explain both of these bills?

MR. DOUCETT: The Public Vehicles Act is not changed in principle in any way, and the Acts are complementary to each other. There are very few changes. In both cases they must go before a board for a certificate or a licence, and in the latter Act, the Public Commercial Vehicles Act, the authority to make regulations with regard to deliveries and collections of C O D's. There has been a little difficulty there. Other than that, it is more or less putting the Acts in better shape.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker. I desire to table answers to questions Nos 4, 10, 21, 32, 44, 48, 59, 64, 65, 69, 83, 86 and 95.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the day are called, I have pleasure in rising to bring to your attention and to the hon. members of the House the fact that this is the birthday of the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member (Miss Macphail), as we all know, is not a stranger in this Legislature or in parliamentary work. She was first elected to the Dominion House of Commons in 1921, and I think she has grown weary of being reminded that she was the first and only woman elected at that time, and that she is now the only woman member of this House. She may have grown weary of being reminded of those remarkable facts, but I think she will not mind being told again what the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) was kind enough to say on the fourth day of this session, when he referred to the equally remarkable fact that the hon. member (Miss Macphail) was elected to this House in June, 1948, with the largest vote which has ever been polled by any provincial candidate in the history of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not going to take up time dealing with an hon. member who is so well-known to everybody in this House. I would, however, like to say that she is a Canadian of Scottish descent, coming from the County of Grey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: When I say she is of Scottish descent, I am saying of course what we all know, namely, that people of that breed have contributed very considerably to the public life of this country; in fact, there are so many of them that I would not dare speculate whether their influence has been for

good or for bad. I would not even dare talk about that.

However, I do feel, Mr. Speaker, on this happy occasion, I want to express on behalf of our group our greetings to an hon. member of whom we are very proud, not only because of her record, but because of her character and because of our long friendship and association with her.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, may we, from here, join with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in wishing to the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail)—and if perhaps I may just get away from the rather stilted customs of the House and say: Miss Macphail—many happy returns of the day.

I should like to say I was talking to the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) this morning by phone, and he wishes me to extend to Miss Macphail on his behalf sincere good wishes for a happy life.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Macphail, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said, has had a very distinguished career indeed. She has the distinction not only, as he said, of being the first woman elected to any parliament in the British Commonwealth, but she has the double distinction of being one of the first two women elected to this Assembly. In her long public life, dating back, I think, to 1921, she served 19 years in the House of Commons, and she is now in her fourth year in this assembly.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the birthday of the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail), I am going to ask her to do something which caused great merriment when I suggested that I might do it the other night, that is, step out of her political role for a minute, and, as an Ontario woman—which is a great honour indeed to be an Ontario woman—and also as a distinguished public servant of this country and of the province, I am going to ask her now to represent us all. As soon as these felicitations are over, I am going to call the Order which stands in her name as No. 12 and ask her to move that resolution on behalf of everyone in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt in the new province of Newfoundland itself and in Canada, there may be—it would be unusual if there were not—some differences as regards features which relate to that Union, but the fact is that before the end of this month, His Majesty the King, if he has not already done so, will give Royal assent to a bill which will make Newfoundland the tenth province of our great Dominion of Canada. I think it is altogether fitting that the people of Ontario should welcome these fine and brave people, with their great province, their island and their great mainland on Labrador, to this Confederation. I think the resolution which the hon. member (Miss Macphail) has moved, and which I shall read, is fitting and carries with it the sentiments of everyone in this House and the people of Ontario:

> "That the members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, desire to express their high regard for the people of Newfoundland and to convey to them, on behalf of the people of Ontario, most sincere and cordial greeting; and that this House place on record our appreciation of the deep historic significance of approaching events whereby Ontario, one of the first provinces, will be joined in Confederation by a tenth province, and our sense of pride in being more closely associated hereafter with the worthy people of that great island; and further that this resolution be engrossed and forwarded by the Speaker of this House to the Speaker of the Legislature of Newfoundland, as soon as he may be elected, in token of the wholehearted welcome it is desired, on behalf of the people of Ontario, to extend to Newfoundland and its people."

Mr. Speaker, I think now it is altogether fitting we should ask this

distinguished member of our Assembly, representative of the women of Ontario, at this time, to move this resolution which, when the time comes, will be responded to by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, before my hon. friend, the member for East York (Miss Macphail) moves the resolution standing in her name, I want to say that, from this area of the House, we join wholeheartedly in the good wishes which have been extended to her on this most important of all days, perhaps. Those of us who have not known Miss Macphail very long—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: —but who have gained a knowledge of her great work since she came into this Legislature, have learned to appreciate the fine quality of heart and mind that she possesses, and I am told that history will record that she is eminently fitted to be an hon. member of this Legislature for a great many reasons, two of which stand prominently in my mind at the moment. Miss Macphail was for a number of years the representative in the Dominion House of the riding of South East Grey, which was predominantly agricultural, and now she represents in this Chamber the riding of East York, which I think hon. members would say was more than half industrial, so that she brings to the Legislature a thorough and a growing knowledge of both of these great elements in our population.

May I say, as I sit down, Mr. Speaker, that we have grown very fond of Miss Macphail in our short acquaintanceship, and when she the other day said something about being "squeezed"—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: —the thought ran through my mind that if this were to be a collective operation, I was against it; if it was to be put on an individual basis, I had no real opposition to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS, Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: May I say again, Mr. Speaker, that we do congratulate my hon. friend (Miss Macphail) on this day, and any remarks on the resolution I would like to reserve for the moment.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, we should like to join with the acting leader of the government (Mr. Frost), the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) in extending our warm greetings and congratulations to Miss Macphail on the occasion of her anniversary. I have had the good fortune to know Miss Macphail for almost twenty-five years now, and I assure you that I hold her in the highest regard, as a great Canadian and a woman who has made an outstanding contribution to the life of our nation.

She has been responsible for many good things in her short lifetime, but perhaps there is one particular thing for which she should receive credit today and that is for the part she played in sending to this Assembly a man who proved yesterday that he could out-shout anybody else in the Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I will call Notice of Motion No. 12.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notice of Motion No. 12.

"By Miss Macphail; resolution:

'That the members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, desire to express their high regard for the people of Newfoundland and to convey to them, on behalf of the people of Ontario, most sincere and cordial greetings. And that this House place on record our appreciation of the deep historic significance of approaching events whereby Ontario, one of the first provinces, will be joined in confedera-

tion by a tenth province, and our sense of pride in being more closely associated hereafter with the worthy people of that great island. And further that this resolution be engrossed and forwarded by the Speaker of this House to the Speaker of the Legislature of Newfoundland, as soon as he may be elected, in token of the wholehearted welcome it is desired, on behalf of the people of Ontario, to extend to Newfoundland and its people.' "

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Mr. Speaker, before I move on to the resolution, may I say that I have always wondered how the people would feel if they heard all the kind remarks that were said about them after they were dead. Now I know, and I am still alive to enjoy it. It was very kind of all hon. members of the Legislature, and I do appreciate it; however, I want to warn them I am still alive and kicking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: I am not going to read the resolution again, but may I move the resolution standing in my name, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), because I feel that every hon. member in the Legislature wants to send a hearty welcome to our new province, Newfoundland.

I am not going to speak at length. We do feel that something very valuable is being added to Confederation. Newfoundland is an old province, the first Crown colony, discovered by John Cabot. However, it was 86 years after that time before it was really taken possession of in the name of Queen Elizabeth by, I believe, Sir Humphrey Gilbert.

There was in the early days a struggle against the tilling of the soil by the people who were interested in other matters. They really did not want any permanent settlement in Newfoundland, although in Sir Francis Bacon's opinion, the fishing off Newfoundland was "more valuable than all the mines of Peru," a quotation from a very small and interesting book by Lord Ammond, which is a recent one, written a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I think Newfoundland brings us something we need. We are a "factory-produced" sort of people. In the old days of the pioneers of Ontario, I often heard the old folks tell about "characters" who developed and who were just different from anybody else, but now we go out and find we are very much alike. Of course, we do not always seem just the same as others, but we are very much alike.

I think Newfoundland brings us something which probably we need in Canada, something possessed by people who stand on their own feet and have developed themselves quite independently of forces which tend to make us alike. "Characters" have developed there; they are more outstanding, I think, than we who have been "smoothed off," so we are very much alike.

They have been a people who are brave, and they have been great producers, although they have not always received the wealth which their great productions merited. They have developed in their sea-faring and fishing lives a tremendous bravery and courage. They have produced many great people. They have sent many great people to us, and for that we are grateful. It is no wonder now we are going to welcome them when they are all coming, although they are staying in Newfoundland and Labrador, and I am sure we are looking forward indeed to visiting our new "brothers by the sea."

I think people who go down to the sea in ships—and do not always come back—develop a sort of courage that fears nothing, neither wind nor wave, neither man nor beast. They have to have a tremendous courage within themselves or they could not make a living in that way, and I think that brings to us as a nation something which is very precious and very much needed.

We have in Toronto a Newfoundlander who has added much to the culture of this city. I am referring to Mr. E. J. Pratt, who is indeed a very noble and fine poet and who has written

in two stanzas a tribute to the women of Newfoundland. It does not mention them, but it shows you have to be very brave to be the wife and mother of fishermen who go down to the sea in ships to earn their living in the hardest possible way. It is called "Erosion":

It took the sea a thousand years,
A thousand years to trace
The granite features of this cliff,
In crag and scarp and base.

It took the sea an hour one night,
An hour of storm to place
The sculpture of these granite seams
Upon a woman's face.

I think in two stanzas, it says the whole thing. I think probably the wife of the miner and the wife of the fisherman, as well as the miners and fishermen themselves, have a courage which the rest of us fail to understand, because every day they go to work, they run the risk of losing their lives that day.

I remember one time when I was down in Nova Scotia, which was referred to by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) just now—a very long time ago—in the strike. A woman whose husband was a miner said, "Every day when my husband goes out the door, I do not know but what that is the last time I will see him." I think the same thing is true of the people of Newfoundland, that every time they go out on the sea to fish, they run tremendous risks, and those they have left at home know that full well.

I think we, all of us in this Legislature and in the Dominion of Canada, are very happy to have Newfoundland become part of this great nation, a nation which is growing up, and which is maturing. We can see it. Since I went into the House of Commons in 1921, I have seen a tremendous difference, a real national spirit developing—not in the worst form of nationalism, but in standing on our own feet, in being ourselves, not leaning too much either on our great neighbour or on our great mother nation, Great Britain.

I think Newfoundland, lying off our shores, quite naturally, geographically, belongs to this continent in a way that she could not belong to any other "bump of land" that lies farther away. Therefore, I say for you all: "Welcome to Newfoundland, and we hope that we have the time and the opportunity to go to see Newfoundland and Labrador as we have not up till now, and we hope that the years which lie ahead will mean for them and for us development and happiness."

May I say, in closing, that this Province of Ontario had in the early days and has even yet, a great spirit of hospitality. I can recall stories told by the pioneers which have been handed down two or three generations, how, when visitors came into a neighbourhood, they did not have very much, but when they would see them going and coming, the neighbours would send over the best things they had in order that their neighbour could have a fine dinner or supper, or whatever it happened to be, for their friends; that there was a sharing which I think probably you get only when a country is very new. However, I think we still have something of the spirit of hospitality, and so we want to say to all Newfoundlanders who may come on to the mainland, that we welcome them and will welcome them individually. We welcome the 350,000 or 400,000 of them as a whole, and individually, we welcome each one of them and say that if they will come to see us, we will be delighted, and we are indeed happy they are going to be a part of this great nation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, before speaking to this motion, I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) on her birthday today. I wish her many years of active and useful life, always, of course, we hope, limited to the opposition benches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Nevertheless, that may merely be the personal opinion of some hon. members on this side of the House.

I think the motion which is before us is a motion which can be unanimously supported by every hon. member of this House. We know that on March 31st, Newfoundland will become part of the Dominion of Canada, and we in Ontario wish to welcome those people as citizens of Canada just as heartily as we can.

In view of the importance of the occasion, it was decided that some special mention and emphasis should be laid upon the importance of this event in the schools of the province, and a letter dated March 10, 1949, from the Deputy Minister of Education, was sent to the principals of secondary schools and to elementary school inspectors throughout the province, with reference to the inclusion of Newfoundland in the Dominion of Canada. I think it would be appropriate at this stage that I should read that letter:

> "On March 31, 1949, Newfoundland will enter the Dominion of Canada as the tenth province. The success of the partnership will be determined in a measure by the degree of mutual understanding which will exist between the new province and the other provinces. It is fitting that on the day of Newfoundland's entry into the Dominion of Canada, our schools should devote special attention to her history, geography and economic and strategic importance.
>
> Our new sister province brings to the dominion a long and honourable record, a rich tradition of service within the British Commonwealth, and a future which is bound to be significant for all the western powers.
>
> It is the Minister's desire that the entry of Newfoundland into Confederation should be marked in all our schools by an earnest effort to teach a fuller understanding of our new province and her people.
>
> Each elementary school inspector is asked to notify the schools under his jurisdiction.
>
> F. S. Rutherford,
>
> Deputy Minister."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in expressing, I think I may say on behalf of all hon. members of this House as well as myself, our complete accord in the motion which is before us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, one week from today, Canada will be officially a country of ten provinces, rather than of nine. In supporting this motion of my hon. friend, the member for East York (Miss Macphail), we join with all groups in the House in saying to this new province of ours that "the welcome mat is out and that we are glad that you are going to join with us in making this great country greater still."

When Newfoundland actually joins the Dominion of Canada, she will bring into this dominion many things. She will bring the physical assets which she possesses; there will be industry, there will be the manufacturing industries that she has, but greater and far more important than these, she will bring into Canada a people who have proved their worth down through the years, who have proved their stability and their ability to stand on their own feet and work out for themselves a destiny in ground that is not too good for working out a destiny. It is because of that that we welcome with a greater heart those people into our midst.

Canada is not so great that she could not be greater still. She is not so large that she should not be larger still. There are no reasons at all why we should regret the coming together of ten provinces instead of nine. There is much more on the asset side of the ledger than there is on the debit side. Newfoundland will bring to Canada and to Canadian customs something that through the years has been her very own, and she will be able to blend

with Canadian customs and Canadian tradition those things that have been peculiarly hers throughout the many years; and the net result is bound to be a great upraising, not only of Newfoundland herself, but because of that participation on her part, of Canada, from one end of the country to the other, from ocean to ocean and now, it seems, into the ocean itself.

We do support the motion of my hon. friend the member for East York (Miss Macphail), without reservations of any kind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, we, too, are very glad to support this resolution and to welcome into our Confederation the great Newfoundland people. Perhaps, I can speak of the people of Newfoundland out of greater knowledge than most hon. members of the House, since I was born in that part of Canada in which Newfoundlanders have lived for many years. I have known them as neighbours and close personal friends and I have known them too, as workmates.

Thirty years ago most of the people employed in my home town of Sydney Mines were Newfoundlanders. I am also aware of the rich contribution that Newfoundlanders have already made to the moral, intellectual and cultural life of our country, particularly through such men as Professor E. J. Bright, Rev. Dr. John Line, University of Toronto, and many others. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that every phase of our national life will be enriched by the more than 300,000 people who, in a few days time, will share a common citizenship with us and will go forward with us towards that great destiny which lies before our nation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add one or two words regarding the resolution now before the Legislature. It is a matter of personal pride that I, also, happen to represent an organization that organized with the Iron Ore Miners of Newfoundland something more than a year ago. I would like to say, in many respects, they are our people. They have contributed very greatly, not only to the development of our industry, the feeding of the nations of the world, particularly in wartime, but they have contributed, as has been said by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), to our culture and our character. Many of the great men of the church have found their birthplace in Newfoundland and have come over to help us and to give us their character, the character of a rugged people. They have made a great and outstanding contribution, as the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) has said regarding courage, hardiness and vision. I am sure it is a proud day for every hon. member in this Legislature.

It is a particularly proud day for me, personally, to stand here and be a part of this resolution to welcome these people, our people into Confederation. I am sure this will be a very important occasion in the future and we will all look back at some time and be proud of the fact that we participated in such a unanimous feeling of welcome for these people from Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Resolution agreed to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 75th Order;

INSTITUTE OF ACCREDITED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS OF ONTARIO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 75th Order; second reading of Bill No. 5, "An Act to incorporate The Institute of

Accredited Public Accountants of Ontario," Mr. Murdoch.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move that Order No. 75 be discharged. I move the bill be withdrawn.

MR. W. DENNISON: (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, does that meet with the approval of the mover?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I think an explanation is due the hon. members of the House in view of these circumstances. This bill is a bill for incorporation of The Institute of Accredited Public Accountants of Ontario. The bill came forward in the usual way, introduced by Mr. Murdoch to the Private Bills Committee. The group of people, the Institute of Accredited Public Accountants, that sponsored this bill, a group of people who have a dominion charter, have members throughout the Dominion of Canada, and they are people who are highly reputable in every respect. The bill was brought forward but apparently it was not noticed by any department of government that might be concerned with it.

On examination of this bill, we found it goes, perhaps, somewhat further than a Private Bill should go under the circumstances. It deals with matters which are not only for the protection of the members of this organization itself, but it also touches matters of public interest. Therefore, in some respects, at any rate, it deals with matters that should properly be a matter for a Public Bill. It provides, for instance, for education, for the discipline, suspension and expulsion of its own members as well as providing for a course of study to be pursued by student members. It also provides a certificated member of the Institute shall be known as an Accredited Public Accountant and may affix this name, Accredited Public Accountant and the initials A.P.A. or both to his name. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, from the information we have been able to get that up to the present time there is no settled curriculum that has been adopted by this group, and no arrangement that may be made with any of our recognized universities have been handled. Any arrangements not only have not been completed but no progress has been made at all.

I also wish to point out that in the early stages of this session I was approached by other groups of accountants in the province, some of whom are incorporated under Public Statutes, such as chartered accounts and also the group of certified public accounts, who proposed that this government should introduce a measure to regulate, to some extent, and to provide for the organizations and particularly of accountancy generally, and regularize practice generally throughout the whole profession of accountancy in its various branches. And now, that proposition came to me when this session had opened and it was quite apparent that there was a difference of opinion between the various groups, included in the provisions of that bill, as to what the nature of that bill should be and to what extent it should affect their respective positions. It was also quite impossible at that stage to make a sufficiently thorough investigation into the whole question, so the government could formulate a proper policy and proper bill, not only for the protection of the profession itself in all its branches and organizations, but in view of the public interests as well. Therefore it was suggested to these people that they should go back and endeavour to iron out the differences that exist between them, amongst themselves, and if they were unable to do that, in due time, we could give this matter very thorough examination departmentally. By this, I mean not merely by the hon. Minister receiving deputations of groups whose ideas conflict but, if deserved, a thorough examination departmentally to see what would be the soundest basis upon which the whole profession, which carries on activities of the greatest importance to the people of the province, could best be established.

Therefore, it was agreed by these other groups of people it would be inadvisable to press forward with general legislation this session, that it should be

referred to the next session. I would suggest to this group of people who are interested in this private bill, that they should confer with the other group of accountants and some effort should be made in general legislation to deal with all the problems which may properly be dealt with in connection with all the different branches and phases of the profession of accountancy. Their viewpoint and desires should be taken into consideration in working out the provisions of a general bill. For that reason, and also because very little progress has been made as to the educational standards they wish to have in force, I did not think any harm could be done if this bill were discharged in this present session, in the hope that by the next session we shall have had plenty of time to investigate this whole matter thoroughly and be prepared to go forward with some adequate legislation. This actually is a public bill because, after all, it does affect the people very materially. That is the standards of people who represent others as accountants, the standards of the different groups of people who are engaged in that profession are of very great interest to the public. Therefore, I think we would be justified in this House at this stage, in allowing this motion to go through and to allow this matter to stand over for the sort of investigation I have indicated.

Also, this motion should include the provision that any fees should be remitted in view of the fact that the matter has come about in this way. I would also like to refer to this. This matter came before the Private Bills Committee and the majority approved of this bill but the bill, from the committee's point of view, was not fully considered at that time as to whether or not it might be properly considered a Public Bill. Also, in committee, all aspects of the problem were not thoroughly aired by that committee.

I think the interests of the profession as a whole and the interests of public policy would be best served if this matter stood over. I can assure hon. members that anything I have said and the action we now propose, does not in any manner reflect on the group of people who have come forward with this bill. They are entitled to the fullest possible recognition, along with other persons engaged in this profession.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) closing remarks that there was to be no reflection on those who asked to have the bill brought forward. I am sure most hon. members of the House are aware of a considerable campaign against the bill which seems to have been started after the Private Bills Committee looked favourably upon the bill and recommended to have it reported to the House. I do not wish to deal with that phase of it but I do think the House should be reminded that at the time the bill was before the Private Bills Committee the Chairman said there was no government objection to the bill. He did not say the government was in favour of the bill but he did say there was no government objection to the bill. At that time, we heard representations on behalf of the two major accounting organizations, chartered accountants and certified public accountants. I think one of the things we should remember here is that if, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) says, there will be considerable work to go on between this and the next session in regard to public legislation dealing with the whole matter of accountancy, I think it should be very much occupied in that investigation with members of this association. It does have a federal charter and exists by provincial charter in Quebec and New Brunswick and similar bills are before the Legislature of British Columbia and Alberta, that the members of this organization are equipped as members of any of the other accounting organization. There can be disagreement about that. There certainly can be disagreement between the chartered accountants and the certified public accountants. They have two separate organizations, two separate sets of rules, two separate courses of study, two separate sets of examinations. I understand, as the hon.

Minister (Mr. Porter) pointed out, that this organization has work under way in regard to setting up similar courses of study with one Ontario university but, as he said, very little has been done.

It is also true that many of the people who have been pressing for this legislation are people who are holding very high positions, high public positions, in this country. They are responsible for very large amounts of money and are fairly qualified to do so. I do not intend to mention names in this debate because who they are I do not think is important.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Would the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) permit a question? Are these men also members of the older organization?

MR. WISMER: Oh, no. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for setting up this organization as contained in this bill if they could be members of the other organization. I think it is important for the House to recognize that the difficulties in becoming members of the other organization, lying in the way of many of these people, is not because of lack of qualifications. It is a procedure difficulty they are in. For these reasons, I think it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the government has decided to withdraw its support from the bill and actually ask that the bill be discharged. I feel that harm is thereby done to highly qualified men in this province, some of them who have worked all their lives in this business, some of them whom I have talked to, who have on their own built up their business and some of them today are actively trying to get this Ontario charter. They do not want it for themselves because they are at the retirement age now but they want it for hundreds of others, who, under this free enterprise system, have built up their own private businesses.

I am not, at this time, going to attack any other organization in the profession, the chartered accountants and certified public accountants, to my mind, have a perfect right to the position they have built up and they have a perfect right to argue before this House or any committee of this House or the government, in such a way as to protect their organization and their membership, and in such a way as to protect the profession of accountancy. However, I think it is also true, in fact I am sure it is true, that had we passed this bill and allowed in the Province of Ontario, the accredited Public Accountants, they would have added to the profession's dignity, since they were highly qualified people. I think we have done some harm to these gentlemen, and for that reason I feel that it is rather letting down the hard-working individual. That is what is happening. We are letting down the hard-working individual, the qualified individual, by discharging this order at this time.

Bill No. 5 withdrawn.

MR. FROST: 77th Order.

TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 77th Order; second reading Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Township of East York," Miss Macphail.

MISS MACPHAIL: I move second reading of Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Township of East York."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 78th Order.

CITY OF OWEN SOUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 78th Order; second reading Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the City of Owen Sound," Mr. Phillips.

MR. W. MURDOCH (PC Essex South): In the absence of Mr. Phillips I move second reading of Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the City of Owen Sound."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 79th Order.

TOWNSHIP OF SANDWICH WEST

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 79th Order; second reading Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West," Mr. Murdoch.

MR. MURDOCH: I move second reading Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: 80th Order.

CITY OF ST. CATHARINES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 80th Order; second reading Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines," Mr. Martin.

MR. C. H. MARTIN (PC Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker I move second reading of Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

MR. FROST: 39th Order.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 39th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 107, "The Fire Departments Act, 1949," Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, before you proceed to call the sections of this bill one by one. I would like to direct the attention of the hon. members to the fact that the proposed modifications of this bill which I mentioned in second reading have been reprinted for the convenience of the Committee of the Whole House.

Without, at this time, suggesting that this would constitute an approval of any of the sections in question, I think it would be convenient if I suggested that they be the sections to be considered—that is, the reprinted sections. I think that would assist everybody, and so, Mr. Chairman, without having to move every individual section, I now move that when we come to those sections they will not have to be moved individually as reprinted.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 10.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): May I hear the changes in Section 10? I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) would indicate them.

MR. BLACKWELL: I might say the modifications I referred to on second reading, are contained wholly in Part II.

Section 10 agreed to.

Section 11 agreed to.

On Section 12.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): In Section 12 I was just wondering about hydro rental cost, if they were charged against the fire department would that be looked upon as a legitimate cost?

MR. BLACKWELL: As a matter of fact, for the information of every hon. member, we gave very serious consideration whether that should be included or not. We thought that would cause a considerable amount of confusion in getting mixed up between actual operations of the fire department and public utilities in the municipality and we decided at the present time, at least, not to include that.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Under Subsection 2 of Section 12, where fire department has equipment on order, and it has been ordered for some time, to be payable upon delivery, can that be construed as part of the operating costs?

MR. BLACKWELL: I would say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member from one of the Windsor Ridings, that the test there is when payment begins. That particular modified section was put in the bill to clarify what we do in the payment of subsidies. Notwithstanding that the municipality may finance in some way, we pay our full subsidy. I would say where something was on order and comes to the fire department, and that payment started in 1948—unless it was before 1948 when those payments started in—they would be elegible.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): You mean if they are approved?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): How much is it estimated that this change will add to the amount of money to be paid out in the coming year?

MR. BLACKWELL: We have not estimated that individually and I think it would be impossible to estimate that. It is much easier to estimate expenditures in the over-all because variation from one year to another year what somebody might finance and pay for in cash is such a wide variation it is not capable of estimation.

MR. WISMER: This sort of thing was excluded before in the bill—payment of equipment which was going to be paid for—it will be excluded as to payment. Now, it has to be paid for, and the full 10 per cent., and the 25 per cent. payment will be made this year regardless of whether the fire department debentured its costs, and so I wonder if the government had thought how much that would add to the total payments in the coming year.

MR. BLACKWELL: No, Mr. Chairman, the original intention was that equipment paid in that way would be the subject of subsidy, and elsewhere under the bill the intention was to include it as the payments were made, but we felt that from the point of view of administration that that did not work too well and should be brought back on the same basis as always followed in the Department of Municipal Affairs, and followed in the Highways Department. It would be more in line with public administration of the province.

MR. DENNISON: In connection with Subsection 1 (i) the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) the other day mentioned something about assisting with fire halls. Is it the intention under that to assist in the original setting up of any department with any payment to the fire department itself?

MR. BLACKWELL: No, the intention at the present time is not to include the erection of fire halls within the scope of the subsidy.

Section 12 agreed to.

On Section 13.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, Section 13 "1" (c); I am going to move these additional words:

> "and under which the contributions of the municipality equal or exceed the contributions of the full-time fire fighters."

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): That takes care of Windsor.

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we took care of Windsor as it was drafted, but I felt, if these additional words were not added, it might result in collective bargaining to force unequal payments on the fire department.

Section 13, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 14 to 21, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 107 reported.

MR. FROST: 40th Order.

THE POLICE ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 40th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 108, The Police Act, 1949, Mr. Blackwell.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I make the same general motion as I did

at the opening of the committee on the other Act, that these reprinted sections, which contain the modifications which I mentioned, will be the ones that will now come forward for consideration, each one being subject to debate as it is raised.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 7.

MR. DENNISON: Under Section 7, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) how is it, in the case of a town like Orillia, it will cost the town approximately $32,000 to maintain their own eight-man police force? The province can give them a ten-man provincial police force for $20,300. Before he answers the question, I would like to draw his attention to the fact that the Orillia branch of the Canadian Legion and the local ratepayers' association, as well as the local municipal government, all objected to the change in the Act, and all were very puzzled by the fact that the requirements—the actual force they did set up —makes the cost of local police force prohibitive in comparison with what the province is able to give them. Now, I would like to have that particular point explained.

MR. BLACKWELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I have some very useful information here for the hon. member from St. David (Mr. Dennison) that he can pass along to the member of the Orillia Council with whom he personally communes from day to day. I think it will straighten him out. The situation under the bill before the House is directly the reverse of the impression of the member of the Orillia Council and the member from St. David (Mr. Dennison) has.

MR. DENNISON: Well, the legion have the same idea.

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh, well, they can be misinformed, too.

The point is this—and I indicated this point on second reading—we have 60-some-odd provincial police agreements in force in the province today. The municipalities having those agreements are not paying the full cost of policing. There is a substantial provincial subsidy represented by the fact that the municipality has been paying the province $1,750 per year for policemen when they cost us $2,300 to $2,400 on the average, and also equipment, and so it is quite obvious that the municipalities which have had provincial policing at that rate with that subsidy, would have less police cost than a municipality running its own police force receiving no subsidy. This bill puts Orillia into a position, without having to enter into any agreement with the province, where it will get exactly the same subsidy running its own police force as another would get which enters into an agreement. I would just like, if the hon. member from St. David (Mr. Dennison) would pass that information along quickly to the alderman, the legion and ratepayers' association.

MR. DENNISON: The subsidy in the case of Orillia will be what amount? 15 per cent?

MR. BLACKWELL: It is the population. You can figure that out.

MR. FROST: 20 per cent, I believe.

MR. BLACKWELL: I believe it is in the 20 per cent, but you can easily check up from the opening part of Part III.

MR. DENNISON: You are still giving them a better deal if they took the provincial force than you would give them if they established their own force and took the 20 per cent?

MR. BLACKWELL: No, I would not say so.

MR. DENNISON: The point I am getting at, is it the policy of your department to deliberately force a municipality, by its financial set-up into adopting provincial policing? Do you want to see every municipality in the province ultimately adopt provincial policing? Is that your policy?

MR. BLACKWELL: No. I do not know where the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) could possibly

get the impression he is now putting forward.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He is just asking a question?

MR. BLACKWELL: I explained it in the bill. If you will read the bill a little farther, you will find that these municipalities which are policed by the provincial police will be exactly on the same subsidy basis as those supplying their own police. It is in the bill.

On the other aspect of the case, I will deal with the point the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) has raised.

The department has been very careful not to approach the municipalities of the province and try to induce them to enter into a provincial-policing scheme. As a matter of fact quite a number of secondary cities in the province have approached the department, and we have always taken the view, in relation to the size of the municipality, that what they should do is to try and put their own municipal police into shape. That is for very obvious reasons. We do not want the expansion of the provincial police to proceed at a more rapid rate than it is expanding now, because the tendency would be to get top-heavy with men without too much experience. I think the final result will be that the one or two-men police forces, which do not make a good administrative unit, will in the course of time largely disappear, and it will be at the instance of the municipality itself. It is up to them. But where the police unit is large enough to lend itself to a sound administration, the municipalities will continue to direct the operation of their police forces. That, I think, will be the result.

Section 7 to 25 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 26.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on Section 26; it deals with a clause upon which I spoke in the second reading stage of this bill, and that is the clause which seeks to deny the members of the police forces the right to join a bona fide trade union. There is no need for me to repeat what I said at that time. Much more could be said, but I doubt whether it is necessary. I, therefore, want to move, Mr. Chairman, that Section 26 of Bill No. 108—the section which denies the members of a police force the right to join a trade union—be deleted from the bill.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no seconder to this motion.

MR. SALSBERG: I am very happy to advise you that in committee, no seconder is required. I have been waiting for this chance for a year, to come back at you. I fell for it a year ago, and I remember at that time I could not get a seconder, Mr. Chairman, but to keep the records straight, a year ago I fell for it, now it is clear to all hon. members of the House that in committee, you need no seconder.

MR. PARK: Mr. Chairman, I think the inclusion of such a section as Section 26 in this Act reflects a lack of confidence on the part of the government in the members of the police forces of this country and of this province; that they do not think the members of the police forces are capable of mixing or associating with ordinary working men in their union organizations; that in some way or other an association with working men undermines their ability to adequately serve law and order.

I regret that the government of Ontario apparently feels that it cannot trust the policemen of this province to associate with ordinary workers in trade union organizations. I think, too, it reflects on the labour organizations of this province. I thought, when the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) was speaking the other night, and he told us that one of the reasons for the inclusion of this particular clause was that in some way, the police forces could not be associated with any group in the enforcement of law and order, and, therefore, if they were associated with a labour movement, it would, somehow

or other, weaken their ability to do their job.

I suggest to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that the association of policemen with the labour movement in this country will not weaken their ability to perform their duties, any more than the association of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) with the Law Society of Upper Canada weakens him in the performance of his duties. The inclusion of such a section as No. 26 reflects on the good name of the organized workers all through this province. I think the policemen of this province can be relied upon to come to a decision as to whether they want to associate themselves with other workers, and I think they should be given the same civil liberties and civil rights in that matter as are enjoyed by other workers. I think we are not engendering much respect for law and order when we are not permitting the policemen in this province to have the same rights of law and order as are enjoyed by other workers in the province

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Chairman, I have not much to add to what the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) has said, except to say that it seems to me we are dealing with fundamentals in this particular section.

I regret that in this progressive Province of Ontario we should be associated with an anti-labour Act of this kind, because this is definitely an anti-labour Act.

It seems to me the police might benefit by being associated with a trade union. They certainly have the collective bargaining right, and they would be able to benefit by association with a trade union. On the other hand, I think the trade union would benefit by having the association of people who are reliable, and who hold their position because of their reliability, and their ability to observe the law, and keep law and order. I would like to have the police associated with the trade unions on a completely voluntary basis.

One of the fundamentals of our labour laws is that people have the right of association. But here you are saying that the police do not have the right of such association. Where does the thing stop? Because you want some other group to be exempt, then you will say that they also have not the right of association. Or you may say to another group because they work for a municipality, they do not come under the Labour Relations Act. Yet here we have a group which works for the province or for the municipalities, and we want to deny them the fundamental right of voluntary association. That is exactly what we are doing. If a man is raised in a union home and believes in union principles, having joined a police force in the Province of Ontario, he is "out" as far as continuing the union traditions, when his very nature is attuned to the idea of unionism and union association. I believe the police need the trade unions, and I believe the trade unions need the police, and I believe we are denying a very fundamental right when we say to a group of our citizens: "You cannot belong to this organization or that organization." It is in fact, as bad as the law in the Province of Prince Edward Island, where they have gone one step further and say that no group of workers can be affiliated with trade unions outside. Immediately you run into complications. You say the police forces in the province cannot be associated with trade unions. What about the Dominion Police, the R.C.M.P.'s? Are they going to be stopped on the same basis? Are you going to say, as they have said in Prince Edward Island, that railroaders cannot be associated with their national association, yet they are dealing with the national features as far as collective bargaining is concerned?

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the government ought at this time to give very serious consideration to the implication, because we cannot say in the Province of Ontario that we honestly believe in collective bargaining; we cannot say we believe in freedom of association on a voluntary

basis, as long as we start to pick out groups, and say, "You cannot belong; civil servants cannot belong; other groups cannot belong to an association of their choice, particularly the trade unions, in this case."

I plead with the government, and I am forced to support the motion now before the committee on the question put forward by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). There is no other decision I could take as a citizen and as a trade unionist but to support the idea of the withdrawal from this Act of this section at this time. It has no place in this Act, and it has no place in democracy.

MR. J. D. BROWN (L, Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I am speaking as one whole-heartedly in favour of trade unions. I also speak as one who believes that the police force of any municipality should be under the same economic provisions and conditions as any other municipal officer, but I do feel that this section in this Act has a very good place, because it is my opinion that the police forces, when they are acting as such, are not citizens of a municipality, but they are the law of the municipality. They are the men who enforce the law, and as such it seems to me, they should not be subject to any provisions of a trade union.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a brief word about the motion by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). I must say, in regard to this matter, I disagree with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) when he says "as a citizen and a trade unionist he cannot agree with this section." If he had said "as a trade unionist" and left the "citizen" out of it, then it would be quite comprehensible to me—

MR. MILLARD: I do not think there is any difference.

MR. BLACKWELL: —because with the important position he holds in the trade union movement, I understand what an embarrassing position he would be in if he supported this section, having the attitude he has taken about it.

But when he comes to look at it from the point of view of a citizen, I might say that, quite contrary to this section being in any way directed against civil liberty, a section of this description is necessary so that for all people civil liberties may be maintained.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: I would not for one moment classify the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) with the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). After all, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard)—

MR. MILLARD: There is some good in all people.

MR. SALSBERG: In the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) too?

MR. BLACKWELL: He did not view with pleasure the fall of Czecho-Slovakia, and did not march with the Communists in the Champs in France. As a matter of fact, I want to commend the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) on how moderate his expression of views in this Legislature has been during this session. The only time I could really quarrel with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) was when he made a speech, which I feel he must have regretted in some measure, in relation to the law enforcement during the general strike in Hamilton. That was quite understandable, and I believe he had some regret about that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It was not a general strike.

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you for the correction. I meant to say the steel strike.

MR. MACLEOD: Wrong again.

MR. BLACKWELL: I want to say that even with reference to the statement by the hon. member for West York

(Mr. Millard) in Hamilton, it indicates how well it would be to have a force, the job of which is to maintain the balance of law enforcement between all groups in the community, in an association where they would be constantly embarrassed by continued propaganda against law enforcement.

The wires, the telegraphs that come in, the language they use about the "intimidation" of pickets by provincial police and other police forces are known to hon. members of this House to be unutterable nonsense, because what happened when provincial or other police intervene is, they are preventing—their "intimidation" intimidates from intimidating other people illegally.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you repeat that, please?

MR. BLACKWELL: All right, you read it.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Repeat it, repeat it. I just want to take it down.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is the situation. How can a working man—because policemen are working men with a job to do—be properly in an association where they would be subjected to that sort of organized propaganda, day in and day out? I regret very much that this particular attitude on this subject should be persisted in from any quarter of the House, because it is highly undesirable that the body which is responsible for law enforcement should ever get in a position where there is a conflict between its duty and its interest.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. BLACKWELL: And that it should become involved in attempting to represent the affairs of any one particular class or group in the community.

I appreciate the indication of support from the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Brown) and for the government, Mr. Chairman, I say that section must remain in the bill.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, before we vote on this amendment, I find myself obliged to make some reply to the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) remarks.

I want to say that what struck me very poignantly during the discussion of this part of the bill in second reading was the language the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) used. His language was very appropriate, I thought, and scientifically very correct, and, from him, very typical.

He spoke of "policing" as something you "purchase and sell"; he used such expressions. "You can purchase police protection" at so much; and at another time he said: "You can sell police protection" at so much.

It is an item that is bought and sold at so much per.

In other words, you could almost walk in to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and say: "Sell me 69 cents. worth of police protection this morning." I do not mean to say that he will sell you 69 cents. worth of police protection in any morning, but the interesting revelation in the language that he used when he spoke of police protection revealed that it is a matter bought and sold, and usually the highest bidder gets the advantage.

That is very typical of the mentality which the hon. Attorney-General Mr. Blackwell) has acquired in dealing with police matters.

MR. J. W. HANNA (PC Huron-Bruce): Call in the police.

MR. SALSBERG: He is the one that does that. Now, having paid my respect to the language the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has used in second reading, I want to say that in his remarks a few minutes ago he implied, in his very juvenile fashion, which was referred to by other hon. members of the House yesterday, and which I hate to refer to, but which he compels hon. members to refer to—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: —in trying to set off one hon. member in the House against another in such a delicate manner that almost an elephant was duplicated, that is the delicacy with which he does it—he will try to say: "Well, this hon. member, of course, is not of that sort, but the other hon. member, why, he is of another sort, after all the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) did not march in Czechoslovakia nor did he parade in Paris."

The implication, of course, was that I paraded in Czechoslovakia or in Paris. Well, I want to say that, of course, I did not parade in either of those cities that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) implied I did parade in. Unless his "Gestapo" provided him with "doped-up" pictures, which is not impossible, because you get recognition when you can present material "across the desk" in a manner that will be helpful, and provided—

MR. BLACKWELL: No, it was from a speech, quite publicly.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to say, however, that I would have considered it quite an opportunity to have paraded in Prague or in Paris or in London or anywhere else if such a parade were for a worthy cause and for the welfare of the majority of people.

Having cleared up that point for the record, I want to say that the only correct thing I can agree with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is when he said that policemen are working men. That is the only thing he said I can agree with.

Policemen are working men, they do not undertake this job for the love of any particular thing except of necessity to earn their bread for themselves and their family. That is the truth. Policemen are working men. When they can get out, they get out, and I will not blame them.

Policemen are often obliged to do things they do not like, that is true, but as working men who are taking this job, they are entitled to the rights of every other working man, that is all I am arguing for. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) fails to see the principle involved in this question.

Certainly he has more friends among the police force than I have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: I hope so.

MR. SALSBERG: He knows more of them than I do, and he knows many whom no one else knows, because they are not making themselves visible and recognizable. I am not arguing for anyone for political reasons—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: —in the narrow partisan sense. I am arguing on a principle of the rights of working men who happen to work at policing to enjoy what every other working man enjoys, and it is because of that principal approach to the question that I move this amendment, and I might say I have moved this on a previous occasion when the Police Bill was in a year or two ago, and the same restrictive clause was contained at that time.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, there is only one thing that I find it necessary to say for purposes of the record in relation to what the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has said.

In relation to the language which I used about the "cost of policing," when he rose in this House and completely misrepresented that, he was well aware of what he was doing.

It was the same sort of thing—

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I never rose in this House misrepresenting the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) or anyone else.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yes, you did.

MR. SALSBERG: If anything I said can be questioned, it certainly cannot be questioned that I said it in all

earnestness and believing it to be correct. I certainly never at this time or at any other time consciously, deliberately, misrepresented him.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I might have stood on a point of order when the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) insinuated that my department bought and sold policing to the highest bidder, which the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) knows perfectly well is entirely false.

MR. SALSBERG: I will check *Hansard*.

MR. BLACKWELL: I just want to make that statement. We can never catch up with his distortions and his misrepresentations. I want to say that the only connection in which I used the term "cost of policing" was in relation to a municipality purchasing provincial assistance, not on the basis of any particular event, but on the basis of using that method of maintaining the police force.

The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) knows that perfectly well, and seeks to distort and create the impression by what he says in this House that I meant policing is bought and sold in the Province of Ontario, which of course is entirely false and without foundation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Chairman, there is just one item I would like to have cleared, because as I understood the argument of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) on this particular clause in reference to what I have said, first of all, he tried to differentiate between myself as a citizen and as a trade unionist, a fact which I resent very keenly.

MR. BLACKWELL: Well, you do not need to resent that.

MR. MILLARD: I feel I can be just as good a citizen while being in a trade union—

MR. BLACKWELL: I was not suggesting you could not.

MR. MILLARD: —as any other person can be as a citizen.

Secondly, I cannot follow the argument, Mr. Chairman, in regard to singling out police, because where do you stop? In what way is a clerk in a liquor store, for example, going to be exempted? Have they got some particular job now?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Yes.

MR. MILLARD: That they should not join—

MR. FROST: You could do without your liquor but you cannot do without the policemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Surely the government does not mean that?

AN HON. MEMBER: You could not do without liquor.

MR. MILLARD: What about the other section? That might be called "public service"? Now, the policy of the government is not only to provide law which prohibits a policeman from having any affiliation with a trade union, but by policy, the government also puts a stop to other sections of the public service from associating themselves with trade unionists. Now, what is the object there? That is the point I was trying to make, that if you start with police, you soon come to the situation where you can bar other citizens from this right of association.

I would like to know what the answer is there.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to try to distinguish that for the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard). As a matter of fact, the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is referring to the question of municipal employees.

MR. MILLARD: The civil service and what have you.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is right. After all, the most vigorous defenders of municipal economy we have had in this House for some time was the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and that group, and I would think you would congratulate us for not interfering with municipal economy in that respect.

We make the Act applicable if they pass a by-law, but we do not interfere with relations within their public service unless they do.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What about the provincial public service?

MR. MILLARD: The ones I was talking about are the civil servants; what about them?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The point is, Mr. Chairman. the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) reference to the police would carry more weight if he could honestly say these considerations apply to the police and the police only.

However, as a matter of policy, the government of which he is a member does not permit any of the public service to join such an association—

MR. SALSBERG: And so stated in this House.

MR. JOLLIFFE: —and the argument that he has stated about the special position of the police would sound more genuine at least if he could take an entirely different attitude towards other public servants who are not in the "special position" of the police. That is the point raised by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has not dealt with.

MR. BLACKWELL: No, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that was the point.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, yes, it was.

MR. BLACKWELL: I feel it was raised with relation to the municipalities. I gave that as one example.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) mentioned salesmen in liquor stores.

MR. BLACKWELL: However, I am prepared to deal in the items of public service. We are well aware on this side of the House that in the Province of Saskatchewan they put forward as a great contribution, almost as a respiration of civil liberties to people, that civil servants of the Province of Saskatchewan have been allowed to form a trade union and to affiliate with other trade unions.

Now, I want to suggest that creates exactly the opposite result to the one advertised. Here we have—and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) prides himself that his group has been chosen by a section of the labour union movement as the "political-action arm of labour"—now, how on earth can you possibly run a democracy with different political parties if, in the course of time, to be a civil servant you have to belong to a trade union, you have to be identified with one particular group in the community, and, finally, instead of being able to refrain as you should do in such a position from being partisanly in politics, it will end with the whole civil service of that province, and the rest of the country if it progresses, being in partisan politics, and when that happens, I say to hon. members in all seriousness, we have gone one step too far, and democracy will be "out of the window."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, just to single out one of more outstanding points in this very specious argument—

MR. BLACKWELL: Well, it is my argument, anyway.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In what jurisdiction is anybody obliged to be identified with a political party. Now the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) knows that was an entirely specious point, without any foundation.

MR. BLACKWELL: No, that is the

result of what they are trying out in Saskatchewan.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No.

MR. FROST: Saskatchewan is highly desirable.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No such result is created in Saskatchewan, and my hon. friend (Mr. Blackwell) knows no such result is created.

MR. BLACKWELL: I know no such thing. Such a result is contemplated in Saskatchewan.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What happens in Saskatchewan is that the provincial civil servants are free to affiliate with the trade union movement and some of them are affiliated.

MR. BLACKWELL: And some of them would be pretty scared not to.

MR. FROST: They are also instructed to go and make political speeches.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I must say I am flattered that these interruptions start to explode when I make a point.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman—

MR. JOLLIFFE: There you are, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FROST: We have been getting along very well this afternoon.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We have indeed, but if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is going to talk "bunkum," I am going to correct him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am going to correct you, too.

MR. SALSBERG: He always starts it.

MR. FROST: I want to "pour oil on the troubled waters."

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh, let us have some trouble.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you talking politics or nonsense?

MR. FROST: In view of the very stormy afternoon and the fact we have got along so well today, may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the argument be confined to the matter of the section of the Act in question, and we leave the rest out of it and see if we can get on with some of our estimates and complete these bills.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I agree entirely with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

I will tell you why—

MR. BLACKWELL: Then why did you bring it all up?

AN HON. MEMBER: There we go.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No self-control at all.

MR. BLACKWELL: You start something, and then say you agree with somebody else. Just another mis-statement; that is all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I agree with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). I think we should stick to the point, and in connection with this point, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) asked: "Well, if you lay down this rule about the police, what about the people who are clerks in liquor stores?" He was referring to the liquor stores in Ontario. A minute later the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is away off in Saskatchewan. I agree with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) we should stick to the point, but when the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) goes wandering off to Saskatchewan and makes statements which have no foundation whatsoever—

MR. MACLEOD: To Czechoslovakia.

MR. JOLLIFFE:—and charges people will be obliged to be associated with a political party, I will certainly correct him.

MR. BLACKWELL: You are virtually in Saskatchewan.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) could keep the Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) quiet, we might get ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. L. HALL (PC Halton): Mr. Chairman, might I be permitted to answer one statement that was made by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). I think it was off the point in question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. HALL: He made a reference that our provincial police force in the Province of Ontario could be bought and sold.

MR. SALSBERG: I didn't say that.

MR. HALL: That it could be bought and sold. You made that statement.

MR. SALSBERG: No, Mr. Chairman, I did not even imply anything like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no?

MR. BLACKWELL: No, he meant I could be bought and sold.

MR. HALL: You implied the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) could buy and sell our provincial police force.

MR. SALSBERG: No, I said—if the hon. member (Mr. Hall) will permit me, I will enlighten him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down, Joe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: I said the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell)—

MR. HALL: I will sit down, but let me finish first. I did not interrupt you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down. Sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. HALL: I did not interrupt you, do not interrupt me.

MR. SALSBERG: But do not misquote me.

MR. HALL: I want it read into the records of this House that our provincial police force is the finest force in the world, bar none.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Some of it.

MR. HALL: And while I am on that, there is hardly one now on the provincial police who did not serve in the armed forces.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then why do you not let them join a union?

MR. HALL: They fought, as the others did, to give you a right to sit in this Assembly. Do not forget that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: You did.

MR. HALL: This is a free country with free speech.

MR. MILLARD: Free association.

MR. HALL: And there is not a place where this is exemplified and used more than by hon. members right here, who do not believe in the freedom they enjoy by sitting in this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HALL: I say on behalf of our provincial police, I as one citizen will not stand for any person to say or imply that our provincial police force can be bought or sold.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the record, I feel obliged to say that I did not say that. I do not know whether the Ontario Provincial Police Force is the finest in the world, but I think it is a very fine group of men. I have never said, nor thought,

nor implied that they as a force are to be bought or sold. I merely referred to the language that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) used to the best of my knowledge or memory in speaking in this House. However, that was all, there for no reflection on the force. I hold them in as high regard as the hon. member (Mr. Hall) who has just spoken.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I want to be quite clear about this because I am sure the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) wants to do himself the justice of making his own position clear. He explained earlier that, in his view, it is incompatible that the functions of the police to be affiliated with organizations in which, according to his view, there is a great deal of propaganda against law enforcement. That when the question was put to him, "is not this a policy of the government also with reference to other civil servants who do not have any special responsibility for law enforcement," he evaded the question.

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh, no.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He should answer the question.

MR. BLACKWELL: You just did not like the way I answered it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) position is this that a type of civil servant of the Province of Ontario, as far as the government is concerned, must be deprived of a measure of their liberty; they must be deprived either by policy or by law of a measure of that liberty which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Hall) was talking about just now. That is a part of the law. So far as the police and other members of the civil service are concerned with this government—I want to be quite clear about that, and I am grateful to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) for confirming it today —the government believe some of the civil servants of this province should be deprived of some of their civil rights.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) suggested that because our police force associated with fellow Canadians in a trades union they would not do their duty. He felt they should be isolated, they should be set apart in the community and not allowed the ordinary life of other citizens of the province. Now, I would like to suggest that during the war, Service Police in the Air Force, for instance, lived with the men; they lived and slept in the same barrack block; they ate in the same mess hall and, if the occasion arose and they were asked to do their duty against their fellow airmen, the Service Police did their duty.

MR. BLACKWELL: But you did not establish collective bargaining and trade unions in the army.

MR. TEMPLE: They lived in close association with their fellow airmen and at all times were treated as other airmen in the service were treated. I would like to suggest, that in some countries on our extreme right, police forces are denied the democratic privilege of joining a trade union. Similarly in other countries on our extreme left, police forces are also denied the right to join a trades union. I think in this country we should set an example. Our policemen should have exactly the same rights as other citizens. They should be granted the right to join a trade union, and I am quite sure if the time should arise when they would be called upon to exercise their authority, they would do their duty as good citizens. I believe that by setting them apart, we are going contrary to good legislation and good government and I am going to support the motion to amend Section 26.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple), when do the Labour Government of Britain — which is a socialist government, supposed to have the same ideology as his group—propose to let the police in Britain join trade unions.

Furthermore, when do they propose to give them collective-bargaining rights, and, furthermore, when are they going to raise their pay to where we have it in the Province of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I just rise to be sure that the record is straight.

MR. FROST: You all follow your spiritual leaders over there.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) started it.

MR. WISMER: I would like you to follow some of your spiritual leaders. I point out to you that we are not asking you to do something the Liberal Government and the Conservative Government have not already done in this country. In the Conservative-Liberal Coalition in British Columbia, policemen are members of a trade union.

MR. FROST: We think they are wrong.

MR. WISMER: I am just telling you what they are doing and I would like to point out—

MR. FROST: We are not affected by them.

MR. WISMER: I would like to point out in relation to civil servants, it was not very smart to bring up Saskatchewan and say this existed there. Let me remind the House, Mr. Chairman, that the civil servants in British Columbia are affiliated with the Trade and Labour Congress of Canada; the Civil Servants Association of Alberta is affiliated with the Trade and Labour Congress of Canada; the civil servants of Saskatchewan are affiliated with the Trade and Labour Congress of Canada.

MR. FROST: What has that to do with the question?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) brought this up.

MR. FROST: It is out of order. Mr. Chairman, I say this discussion is completely out of order. The discussion should be confined to the section of this bill.

MR. WISMER: I will be through in a minute.

MR. FROST: Keep off that subject. Let us get down to business and stop this nonsense.

MR. WISMER: The Police Forces are either public servants or they are something else. Now, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) would be in a much stronger position to insist that Section 26 remain in this Act, if he could prove to this House that this government and the people supporting the government that the police are a special type of civil servant. What I am trying to point out is that this is not the position taken by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). The position he takes is that all civil servants are to be placed in a category where they cannot have what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) so aptly phrased, "freedom of association."

MR. JOLLIFFE: A 50 per cent. citizen.

MR. WISMER: I am right on the section talking like this. I named some provinces where Civil Service Associations had policemen for members and I will name another one. The Civil Service of Manitoba is affiliated with the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. It is quite all right to say all these people are wrong but the interesting thing about it is that the Government of British Columbia is a Liberal-Conservative Coalition; the Government of Manitoba is a Liberal-Conservative Coalition and in the terms of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) the government for the Province of Alberta is the most muddled of this country. We are not giving the spiritual leadership that we talked about. Why not

take the leadership of the most reactionary government? You do not have to look for the radicals, just look to the reactionaries. In fact there is a much greater reactionary government in this province already than the trade unions and this so-called "progressive government" puts into the law that because you are prepared to eke out your daily life, to actually become a part of the system and administration of law and order, you have to live at one particular end of the street with the blinds drawn. That is what you are asking. We are not talking about anything more than this. This section should remain in the Act, at least as long as this government is in office, if you can say you are prepared to place the police in this position, but if you are not prepared to separate the police because of their very special duties away from other civil servants—

MR. BLACKWELL: It is going to stay in the Act all right.

MR. WISMER: You should agree with the amendment and take the section out of the Act. I am not suggesting that is his own position. His own position is to take the section out of the Act period. There is nothing that has been said this afternoon by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to convince me that the membership of a policeman in a trade union makes him any less an effective policeman.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about 1919 in Winnipeg?

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): Where?

MISS A. MacPHAIL: 1919 sent the members straight to the House of Commons and to the Legislature and—

MR. FROST: Let us get on with the business.

MR. WISMER: Now, Mr. Chairman, if you are going to allow a chit-chat back and forth across the House, allow the Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) to come on with a question, I was waiting for the chit-chat to stop before going on.

MR. FROST: Nothing would stop you, you are like an 8-day clock.

MR. WISMER: Every day that comes up, Mr. Chairman, I have less and less respect for the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost).

MR. FROST: I recognize that.

MR. WISMER: Each time I rise to my feet it seems to release the springs in the hon. Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) chair. I thought this was a serious discussion, a time at which you are asking for freedom of association. If the government does not wish me to continue at the present time, there are three or four more places on the Order Paper where we will have an opportunity to tire them out. Perhaps if we tire them out, in three or four years they will get around to writing with ink on paper the notes and the things they stand for.

Mr. Chairman, this government says it stands for rights of the people and still they insist on leaving Section 26 in this Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Before you put this question in the absence of my leader—I had hoped he would be back before the discussion—but as one who, in the past has some authority in the province and who recognizes the realities of this situation, I am bound to say that I feel I must vote that this section remain in the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: I had that particularly in mind when I voted for second reading of the bill. There is no use saying that the duties of the police force are similar to the ordinary duties of the working man in his ordinary occupation in life. He has a very highly specialized duty to perform in this province and particularly the maintenance of law and order and it would seem to be inevitable to put him into the position that when we have these emergencies that arise in municipalities, or which may arise in a

larger field, that he should be tied up with such associations that he could be ordered out by a union in a sympathetic strike, just when he is discharging his duty. That is why I am voting against this motion and retaining the section in the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (CCF Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Chairman, as one who has had considerable experience in police work, I quite realize the action between the police and the public, but I fail to see where the inclusion of this clause, on this section, will do the things that perhaps the government think it will do. It has taken away from the police boards part of their freedom, that is true, but the reason for the police to join a trade union or an economic organization is still the same. It is still necessary for them to join some economic organization. I feel that if the government would only encourage or, perhaps, see that policemen are paid better salaries, then it would not be necessary for them to join any trade union movement in order to get protection and help which is sometimes necessary. Therefore, I do not think it is necessary for the government to have this in the Act, but the government should encourage—

MR. BLACKWELL: We do.

MR. HARVEY: —economic association of the police officers. In my opinion that should not be in there.

Motion negatived.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The amendment has been voted down, we have not voted on Section 26. I would ask the chairman to put Section 26.

Sections 26 to 34, inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 35.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Chairman, on Section 35, would the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) tell us if the government proposes to give assistance to municipalities in erecting buildings for the housing of their police force?

MR. BLACKWELL: No.

Section 35 agreed to.

On Section 36.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, on Section 36, Subsection 1 (c), I move there be added to that subsection the words:

"and under which the contributions of the municipality equal or exceed the contribution of the members."

Section 36 (as amended) agreed to.

Sections 37 to 42, inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 43.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (CCF Temiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this section particularly covers it, but I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) would tell us of the machinery that is set up for collective bargaining in the provincial police force.

As I understand it, right now, a provincial policeman is charged, tried and sentenced all by the same man.

MR. BLACKWELL: I cannot hear you.

MR. TAYLOR: What is the machinery set up for maintenance of discipline at the present time in the provincial police force? As I understand it, it is possible for a constable to be charged by an inspector, and sentenced by an inspector, and pay deducted and time off and all these things by the same man.

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh, no. Mr. Chairman, what happens on disciplinary matters is, charges have to be laid and evidence taken under oath. The commissioner himself cannot dispose of it himself.

It must go by way of a recommendation to the hon. Minister in order for it to be dealt with, and the thought that individuals throughout the province can discipline in that way is quite in error.

MR. TAYLOR: What assistance is

given the constable? Is he allowed one of the other officers to intercede on his behalf, or what would happen if other constables did intercede?

MR. BLACKWELL: Certainly other constables can appear and give evidence, and so on, without any prejudice whatsoever.

MR. MILLARD: Is there appeal machinery? Supposing the constable feels he has been unfairly dealt with, what is the final appeal of the constable?

MR. BLACKWELL: The final appeal is the Minister.

MR. MILLARD: The reason I ask that is that in the case of the Hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Dunbar) there was a constable who was dealt with, and he went before the Appeal Board of the Civil Service, and they found in favour of his reinstatement, but there was nothing about it. The man was never reinstated. Does the hon. Minister have the final say, or is it the Cabinet?

MR. BLACKWELL: I do not want to get into that on my bill.

MR. MILLARD: Have you the final say?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In connection with the provincial police; the provisions of this Act do not apply to the provincial police, and I believe the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is referring to the final right of appeal from the Commissioner to the Minister. I may have misunderstood him when he spoke a little earlier. Minor infractions of discipline are not taken to the Commissioner, are they? I understood the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to say that it was not possible for an inspector alone to discipline a member of the force, that all such cases had to be taken higher.

MR. BLACKWELL: Nobody, without an order signed by the Minister after an investigation, can either suspend or dismiss a constable from the force, or can he fine him.

Section 44 agreed to.

On Section 45.

MR. J. L. EASTON (CCF Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I can see trouble where perhaps the police go into another municipality and try to enforce law and order, and there may be a dispute as to the authority. May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) if he will explain this section of the Act, which may be amended, giving authority to act as a constable in any muncipality? It seems to me some constables will be going into another municipality to enforce the law. Who will be responsible for giving this direction, where a constable must move into another municipality, or are they going to be allowed to go in on their own authority?

MR. BLACKWELL: That is Section 45?

MR. EASTON: Yes.

MR. BLACKWELL: We recognize that. The law enforcement officers, who are constables, are so all over the province. There is no practical difficulty about that, in that the different jurisdictions are respected, and it gives rise to no problem at all. For instance, if the Toronto police were to start doing police work in Forest Hill, the local municipality would be very much annoyed, and say they have no right to be in there, and this section is for the purpose of enabling them to go in there if they are wanted.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, it is understood that you only go in on the express permission from a municipality?

MR. BLACKWELL: That is not entirely right. We have an anti-gambling squad in the provincial police force which goes everywhere, in the very nature of their duties. If everyone knew they were going there, they would be useless when they got there. I think everybody knows that. But if the hon. member (Mr. Thomas) is

referring to labour disputes, the practice has always been to act on the request of a municipality.

Sections 45 to 47 inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 48.

MR. J. L. EASTON (CCF Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that Section 48 of Bill No. 108 be amended by deleting Subsection 1.

Mr. Chairman, I was quite pleased to hear in the last few minutes that the police would not go into another municipality except upon request of the local authorities.

My reason for asking for the deletion of this section is based upon the fact that it changes entirely the principle of the section, from what is contained in the Statutes of 1947. I believe from what I have gathered from other hon. members who were in the House at that time, that the principle involved in that section was that a Crown Attorney may request the services of a member of the Ontario Provincial Police Force. I believe that was in connection with criminal investigations.

The way it is now, it means the Crown Attorney may request the services of the Ontario Provincial Police—that might mean the entire force—if he so desires. It seems to me that in the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) Department it gives wide power to policemen to go in without the authority from the local police commission or the local council, which is clear encroachment on local authority, and an unwarranted interference in local authority.

I do not want to reiterate what I said the other day, but nevertheless if this section is allowed to pass it gives the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) very wide authority. If this does come into effect, and there is a labour dispute, it seems to me if the police are sent in to another municipality without the request coming from the local authorities, there would be a natural resentment among the people in that area, especially at a time when a critical situation may arise, and the sending of these provincial police in may be the spark which will ignite the powder keg.

I would like to go back again to the strike in Hamilton in 1946. In that strike, in addition to the steelworkers, there were members of the Westinghouse Local Unions and the Firestone were also out on strike. There were thousands of men on strike at that time. As the situation became critical, the Police Commission did ask for the provincial police to come into that area, there was a very great danger there would be civil disorder and there would be a lot of people injured or maybe killed. Those members of these unions, most of whom, or a great many of whom had the members of the Armed Forces, when they knew these policemen had arrived and were in their respective barracks—I am talking now about the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the provincial police—they formed into military formation and there was, in effect, an army of civilians which were created in defence of what they thought were their rights to strike and to picket.

Those in charge of the police at the time, the provincial police and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, must have seen the danger of what might happen if the police were allowed to go out to the picket line and quite wisely, they kept those police inside the barracks and that critical situation went by and no one was hurt or injured.

It seems to me the police should leave this responsibility entirely with the people who know the local situation, where the people are well known to the city police and when there is no danger of friction, as long as there is no attempt at causing any trouble or violence of any kind.

I think we should not use our emergency powers which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has attempted to ask for; when a so-called "national emergency," shall we say, does arise, I say we should not use those powers against the citizens, we should reserve them for the enemy who may be outside our gate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I shall be only a moment on this section, but I speak on it and on the amendment because I think there is an important principle involved. The other day I expressed some indignation because, although this section represented what I thought to be an important amendment, it was not so marked in the text. I see now, and I appreciate the fact that in the reprinted bill, Subsection 1 of Section 48 has been marked "as amended."

In the Act of 1947 the words used were "the Crown Attorney may request the services of a member of the Ontario Provincial Police Force, etc."; in the subsection proposed by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) the wording is "The Crown Attorney may request the services of the Ontario Provincial Police Forces," which, of course, places no limitation whatsoever on the authority of a Crown Attorney to call in any number of the Ontario Provincial Police.

The principle I want to refer to is this, that we are here experiencing a transition from the responsibility of elected representatives of the people in the municipality to by-laws exclusively operated on the part of what my Tory friends like to call a "bureaucrat" and we hear a great deal of chatter from the Tory party about the "dangers of bureaucracy," and a great many furious attacks on the Federal Government for "extending a bureaucracy throughout this country" while, at the same time, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) goes on, year by year, whittling the powers of municipal councils and, in this case, entrusting the power of calling in the provincial police to a Crown Attorney who is a servant of the Provincial Government, and who is subject to direction from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), and who may be removed by the hon. Attorney-General.

I think before such a section is allowed to pass it should be drawn to the attention of hon. members of the House, and to the municipalities concerned, that this power, which was once exclusively theirs, is being transferred to a Crown Attorney. I want to point out there is the other provision in the bill whereby the municipality can get assistance, because the next section, 49, provides that "a board or council responsible for the policing of a municipality or part thereof may, by resolution, request the Commissioner to furnish the assistance of the Ontario Provincial Police in maintaining law and order, etc."

What Section 48 means is simply this, that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) does not trust the elected representatives of the people, and does not trust the Boards of Police Commissioners to deal with this situation. He is going to place reliance instead on the discretion of a hireling of the provincial government and that, I say, is a very important step indeed towards the creation of a bureaucracy, which his party has so often denounced.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): That is not a very nice thing, to call a Crown Attorney a "hireling."

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): My interpretation of 48 is that the Crown Attorney shall request the Attorney-General to call out the police in a matter of extreme emergency and—

MR. JOLLIFFE: It does not say so.

MR. BROWN: —if time permits, then Section 49 will apply.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Where do you get that in 48?

MR. BROWN: I do not get it there, but is that not the purpose of it?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, he will tell you that, no doubt.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): There is another feature to Section 48 that has not been mentioned, Mr. Chairman. Aside from the power of the Crown Attorney to call in the provincial

police, the Crown Attorney, in the process of doing so, may well saddle the municipality with a nice heavy bill if the Attorney-General decides that the municipality should pay that bill.

MR. H. WALTERS (CCF Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, it also leaves it to the discretion of the Crown Attorney as to what is an emergency. The municipal authorities may disagree that it is an emergency, and it may be they think their own force can handle the situation, but the Crown Attorney has power to overrule that and call in the provincial police.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Leave it to the bureaucrats.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, although I am a trifle nauseated by the synthetic indignation of—

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): My, my my; why do you not go home if you are nauseated?

MR. BLACKWELL: Here we go again.

MR. FROST: Did you just wake up? I have not heard from you for a long time.

MR. MacLEOD: No, I am just bored to tears by him. That is all.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): You are getting some of your own back.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Go ahead.

AN HON. MEMBER: Proceed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Get him under control.

MR. BLACKWELL: The object of the section is that the services of the police board are not merely services of personnel that are actually members of the force. We have throughout the province, as some hon. members ought to know, experts of one description and another. We have also a laboratory service and really what that section refers to is, to put it more accurately, "services."

I suppose, without any amendment, if the Crown Attorney were acting under the section, he could get more than one or any number of the force, up to all of it, finally, if that were the emergency section, which is the next one, and there has never been a case of provincial police going into a municipality, except where special service under this section, our Criminal Investigation Branch, our laboratory people, and our other forms of experts.

I wish we could keep the discussion of these different sections off the prejudiced level they have been put on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh,

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have no objection to their going in to assist if the proper authorities think they are needed, but what the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has not explained is why he thinks the Crown Attorney is the person who should decide, rather than the Board of Police Commissioners or the elected representatives of the people.

MR. BLACKWELL: The Crown Attorney has been there for some time.

MR. FROST: That is an old provision. It has been there for years.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You have changed it in this bill. I was not deceived when the change was made, although it was not marked.

MR. BLACKWELL: As the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) knows perfectly well, the effect of the change was to change "members" to "service." They had been capable of being made available by the Crown Attorney for some time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That was not the change.

MR. EASTON: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) we are not objecting to the principle of any assistance going in on the lines he has indicated, but why did he not indicate that in his bill, in-

stead of putting in the "services" of the Ontario Provincial Police Force? Surely, the groups he talks about are such a small number of the whole force, it would be quite easy to put them into the bill, without having to name the whole force. I think that is just an evasion.

Section 48 agreed to.

On Section 49.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): With respect to 49, Subsection 2, has any municipality been required to pay the government for the services of police when they were called in under those circumstances?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the answer is "no", but there was some question whether it could not be regularized by creating statutory authority for the course which has always been followed.

MR. NIXON: I hope you do not charge the town of Paris, or it will be sunk.

Section 49 agreed to.

On Section 50.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move, before quitting, seconded by Mr. Wismer, that The Police Act, 1949, be amended by adding a following section, 49a (1):

"Where the services of the Ontario Provincial Police Force are requested by a Crown Attorney or by a board, as provided in Section 48 and 49, in connection with an industrial dispute in any municipality, for the policing of which a board or council is responsible, the authorization of the council of the municipality must be obtained before such request is communicated to the Commissioner or the Attorney-General.

(2) Before the Commissioner or the Attorney-General shall agree to a request made under provisions of Sections 48 or 49 in connection with an industrial dispute, they shall consult with the Minister of Labour, and a conciliation officer of the Department of Labour shall accompany and advise the officers commanding any group of members of the Ontario Provincial Police whose services are provided."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to rule that, as we passed the section, the amendment is not receivable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We were not past it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You were not listening.

MR. PARK: I am moving a new section.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF): You did not give him a chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR PARK: I am moving a new section.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has been talking all day.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman—

MR. BLACKWELL: Just a moment, please. Perhaps we can straighten it out. Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that amendment related back to the section on which we had the division. I see it does not.

MR. PARK: Then may I speak on it?

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order; I would suggest to you, sir, since we are obliged to come back here at eight o'clock, and it now being five after six, this debate might be adjourned. I say it is not fair. I do not know how long the hon. member (Mr. Park) will speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carry on.

MR. MacLEOD: You speak for yourself, not for me.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accede to that. I would not like my hon. friend, the member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) to go hungry or anything. After all, we like to be humane, and it is five minutes after six.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is immaterial to us, whichever you do.

MR. FROST: I know, but you fellows are so cold-blooded, you do not need anything to eat, but some of the rest of us perhaps do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): The two progressive sections have to be fed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ha, ha.

It being 6.05 of the clock, the committee took recess.

8.00 o'clock p.m.

The Committee resumes.

G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, continuing the discussion on the amendment, which I moved just before dinner, I would like to suggest that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) this afternoon, in discussing Section 48, and in previous discussions under Section 45 of the bill, stated it was the practice to consult local municipalities on all occasions when the issue of bringing provincial police into industrial disputes was concerned, and this amendment—

HON. L. E. BLACKWELL (Attorney-General): I did not say, "consult."

MR. G. EAMON PARK: Certainly, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) suggested that was the practice.

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: I said the practice was to deal with the requests of the local authority.

MR. PARK: Is the hon. Attorney-General now backing away from his suggestion?

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: I am trying to get you to talk in the same terms as I expressed this afternoon.

MR. PARK: The inference was the local authorities, the elected authorities, because it came up in the discussion whether the local authorities had any rights.

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: No, no.

MR. PARK: This amendment attempts to read into the bill a provision that local municipal councils shall be consulted before provincial police are sent in in terms of industrial disputes. I think that is a very desirable provision in the bill, because I know of no group who are better informed or know better the actual situation than men in these positions. They ought to be consulted before the provincial police are sent in, in industrial strikes.

The practice today is to send the provincial police to an industrial dispute as soon as the request is received from an authority in the municipality. It has not always been the municipal council in the past but sometimes the Police Commission, and I suggest, under the terms of Section 48, it could even be the Crown Attorney, as it reads at the present time. It would seem when a request is made for extra police authority, whether it comes from the local authority, which is elected or otherwise, it is the practice for the provincial police to be sent in almost automatically. I think that, in practice, is wrong. As a unionist I have been close to a good many strikes in this province, and on one occasion I had an opportunity to deal with the provincial police in picket line situations, and I have dealt with local police also. I have watched what happens when local commissions and local municipal councils discuss this issue. Even local commissions are subjected to pressure from the companies. They are unable to resist because of local conditions, and on other occasions the companies the endeavouring to have the

police enter a community as a means of frightening inexperienced unionists who do not know their rights under the law. And finally, the provincial police are used as a lever in union negotiations.

I have heard company officials threaten Police Commissions that they would take the law into their own hands if the commission would not accede to the company demand that provincial police be brought in and that the Police Commission has acceded to that demand under that threat from the company.

The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) talks about "intimidation"; that has been going on for a good while.

A number of employers are using a technique of strike-breaking that requires that at some point the provincial police should be brought in, and they are able to exert their full pressure on local bodies to request the police be brought in.

The technique these employers are using is simple enough. If an employer is determined to try and break a strike, he will have little difficulty in finding someone who will be willing to be a tool, who will sell out his fellow men at a price. Through this group, and others, he issues a great many complaints which result in the issuing of summonses, to a number of strikers. A completely false campaign has often been built up by this kind of sponsored complaints to the police and a great fuss made of the issue of law and order, when, in fact, law and order is not in jeopardy. And when these complaints come before a magistrate, in a great many instances—in the majority of cases—they do not result in convictions. Even in such strikes as Kirkland Lake and the steel strike at Hamilton—and I was closely associated with both—in both these cases where the provincial police appeared, a check of the record will show that of a large number of complaints issued against the unionists and pickets, not twenty per cent. resulted in convictions. Yet the companies were able to do a pretty fair job, with the assistance of the provincial police, and the government and the Crown Attorney, in the case of Hamilton, to create the impression there was a much more serious situation there than there actually was.

There was an attempt to use the provincial police to break down the morale of the strikers, to break down the morale of the workers against the employers. That is the use to which provincial police are being put. Whether the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) likes to call it "law and order" that is a situation that exists in picket line after picket line in this province, in industrial dispute after industrial dispute.

The first point I make is that before the provincial police are sent in to a dispute, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) should be sure there is a genuine need for police assistance, and the best place to get that advice is from the local elected council which can tell him all the facts, and so he can be sure the provincial police are not being used as "stage props" against the unionists, as they have been in the past.

Secondly, I think in industrial disputes, there ought to be a consultation with the Department of Labour before the police are sent in. There have been occasions in the past where I think the provincial police have been used in situations where the Department of Labour might have acted to avoid a dispute, where the provincial police so upset the plans that the Department of Labour has been ineffective in attempts to arrive at a conciliation. I suggest there should be a consultation between the Department of Labour and the Attorney-General's Department, where provincial police are being brought into industrial disputes, rather than obviously using the forces of the law and the police, rather than the conciliation service of the Department of Labour in an attempt to arrive at a peaceful settlement of an industrial dispute.

The conciliation service of the Department of Labour, can bring in some people who have had some experience in labour relations. I say to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), most of the inspectors I have seen on picket line situations, do not know anything about industrial relations. The way they approach the unionists and

the workers would seem militaristic. "I am the law and this is the way it is going to be done." They say, "You cannot have picket lines here, you cannot have picket lines there." There is nothing in law, that I know of, that permits them to say so, but they act in a completely high-handed fashion and create situations which lead to unrest and difficulties on picket lines.

I suggest to the hon. Attorney-General, if he is sincerely interested in not using provincial police as a lever in behalf of the companies in industrial disputes, he should engage an experienced conciliation officer from the Department of Labour in a serious attempt to find an amicable solution to the dispute which will be of great aid, and if he will do that, certainly, the likelihood of bloodshed on picket lines will be somewhat less likely than it is under the present circumstances. I am not trying to minimize the difficulties that face the police in industrial disputes. In such situations I know there is a tendency for feelings to run high. That is why the greatest possible care should be exercised in the use of police and those police should not be used to inflame and aggravate those feelings, but rather create a situation to bring about industrial peace.

I am not going to argue that there are not occasions when provincial police or police services are not needed on the picket lines. There certainly are. But, I do suggest every precaution should be taken that these police are not being used, as I said earlier, as "stage props" for a company campaign against organized workers.

I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) might well consider the proposal that a representative of the Department of Labour should accompany the provincial police and should attempt to advise and direct what is needed in industrial relations.

I also suggest that what is needed is some guidance to the police themselves. If we are to have respect for law and order, from the strikers and citizens, we have to have respect for law and order from the police inspectors. As I said, the attitude of the police inspectors handling picket line situations, too often was, "I am the law, I will decide what is right, I will decide what is wrong." And the right to picket and peacefully persuade persons from breaking a strike often fail by the actions of the Ontario Provincial Police, in picket line situations.

Inspectors, without any right in law that I know of, have prevented picket lines from being established where strikes are taking place at the gates of plants, they have eliminated pickets altogether, they have taken the attitude, that they and they alone can determine what is right and what is wrong. They have literally prevented pickets from peacefully persuading others, who were going into a plant they had a right to picket. They have even said, "No, you cannot speak to the would-be strike-breaker in the dispute." They stand back and physically stop the pickets from exercising their rights to peacefully persuade people from entering the plant.

I suggest that in itself is a step beyond the law. If the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) wants some respect for law and order and for the police he should direct them that there is a situation there which needs looking into.

I think the continuous use of police in settling pickets of industrial disputes must eventually lessen the respect for police among all citizens. I think that that is a terrible condition. I do not think for a minute that the police like to see these shoving matches on picket lines that sometimes occur. I do not think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) or his officials want them, either. As a unionist—and I think I speak for all responsible labour leaders in this country—I do not want picket-line brawls to continue.

I, therefore, suggest, to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), he should attempt to develop a police code which will clearly indicate what the rights of the police are and what the rights of the citizens are in such situations as picket lines. I think the hon.

Attorney-General's department should find a group of persons capable of indicating what are the rights of the citizens, of the pickets, and of the police in these situations, and the action by police could go a long way to lessening the industrial troubles of the provincial police.

So I suggest to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that he should consider the proposals that are placed before him in these amendments; first, that before the provincial police are called into industrial disputes the authority of the elected council should be obtained and, secondly, before he sends in the police that he should at least consult with his colleagues in the Department of Labour, and that the services of a conciliation officer should be available in order to assist in the settling of the dispute.

HON. MR. C. DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, I think I should point out to the hon. member (Mr. Park) the fact that I am sure he is fully aware of that, that before this condition arises, that necessitates or justifies the provincial police going into any dispute that a conciliation officer has been used—first, an individual conciliation officer followed by a Conciliation Board, if necessary, and in many cases followed by individual conferences between myself and the two parties in conflict.

MR. PARK: At an earlier stage?

MR. DALEY: At an earlier stage.

MR. PARK: Obviously the Minister missed my point. I want a conciliation officer there to advise some of the officers of the provincial police who go into industrial disputes because, in my experience with them, they know nothing at all about industrial relations. They are completely ignorant of even the elementary rules of industrial relations.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the proposed amending section in its two parts is quite unacceptable.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why, of course.

MR. BLACKWELL: Because it is so obviously foolish on the surface of it. I will give the reasons. I am a little discouraged with what the hon. member from Wentworth (Mr. Easton) said earlier during the afternoon in relation to the steel strike in Hamilton. He spoke of organized platoons of workers and the shedding of blood at that time, and in relation to that I say to the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park)—for reasons I will illustrate—that it is not the police. The trouble is not the police not knowing what the law is governing the picketing. I want to say, in all seriousness in this Legislature, the trouble is with the officials in the labour movement, like the member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park), inviting workers to break the law.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You cannot get away with that. Really it is pitiful to see the ignorance of the rules and traditions of Parliament exhibited on the other side. Now, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has just made a statement against the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) and he should either submit the evidence in respect to his charge or withdraw it.

MR. BLACKWELL: I will submit the evidence right now. The evidence was contained within the four walls of the speech that the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) has made in this Legislature tonight. And, furthermore, I put it to you that he knows perfectly well what the rules of picketing are, and when people are jammed against the gates of industrial plants, he knows it is against the law and yet he tells them to do it.

MR. PARK: Can the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) find any section in the law which says the number of pickets on the picket-line—

MR. BLACKWELL: It is pretty obvious and pretty simple, as you know perfectly well. The law gives any person free ingress and egress, and when you jam it solid, that it not peaceable persuasion; that is obstruction.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) should state on what occasion and at what date the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) incited such activity.

MR. BLACKWELL: I will state the occasion. Right in the Legislature tonight.

MR. PARK: I made no such statement.

MR. BLACKWELL: And it goes on day after day and week after week. I want to say this; the speech that has been made here tonight is the very best exemplification why the police of the Province of Ontario are having trouble, because that is the sort of propaganda—

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are going off the question of whether police could—

MR. BLACKWELL: I see your cheering section is there now.

MR. FROST: I would like if you would draw the attention of the gallery—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) be good enough to indicate in what respect the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) mis-stated the law tonight?

MR. BLACKWELL: I have given you one example already.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Refer to any statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Park) that is inconsistent with the law as it now stands in reference to picketing. Let us have it.

MR. BLACKWELL: I have given one example of simply jamming—

MR. PARK: I made no such statement.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I want the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to cite statements by the hon. member (Mr. Park) that—

MR. BLACKWELL: Don't get full of that synthetic indignation. I can give you—

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are running away from that one.

MR. BLACKWELL: As you so often insist on your own course, I propose to regulate my course, not you.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But you cannot answer my question.

MR. BLACKWELL: I have answered it once, and that is enough. I will give you another example if you like—the mass picketing that took place in the Windsor strike. It was illegal before any police appeared upon the scene.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who incited that?

MR. BLACKWELL: He lends his approval to that, by the remarks he made tonight.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are up against it now.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), I am not really impressed by the performance of the "trained seals" you have behind you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can proceed—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Where is your evidence?

MR. BLACKWELL: If I may proceed, despite the frequent interruptions I am now getting from the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), I would like to say this: the job of the police—and I hope I can say this plainly and frankly—is not to be experts in the merits of an industrial dispute, because in an industrial dispute the sole function is—no matter whether labour may have the merits in a particular dispute, or in another one it may be the management; the functions of the police cannot be emotionally involved on one side or the other—simply to see the provisions of the law are maintained.

I challenge any hon. member in the opposition to put forward one single case where the provincial police have not

acted with prudence under the most difficult circumstances, with the greatest possible restraint and the greatest possible sense of public responsibility.

MR. PARK: Does the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) want some instances?

MR. BLACKWELL: That is their job, and I am not prepared to accept an amendment.

In certain municipalities in this province the police could be prevented from doing its job when there is a serious breach of the law, because we cannot get the type of local councillors, who probably are members of the party opposite —who will say the law is of no importance, that human values are more important than property values. Let me say this to you in Windsor as in Winnipeg—

AN HON. MEMBER: He is your candidate in Windsor.

MR. BLACKWELL: I don't care what he is; he has been everybody's candidate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not ours.

MR. BLACKWELL: Well, he will get around to you before he is through. When they have nowhere else to go you are the last refuge.

I will say in all seriousness the maintenance of law and order in any particular municipality does not happen to be just a lot of rules that somebody puts in the Criminal Code of Canada for the fun of it. These rules are so that people can depend, in a civilized society state, on the maintenance of law and order. May I say in all seriousness that the general strike in Winnipeg in 1919 did the City of Winnipeg irreparable injury and the strike in Windsor in more recent times did the City of Windsor irreparable injury.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): That is nonsense to say that.

MR. BLACKWELL: Because there were people who intended to establish industry in Winnipeg and in Windsor, respectively, who decided it would be far better to go to some place where there would be a better observance and maintenance of law and order than in those particular places, and today in the City of Windsor—

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you like to name one?

MR. BLACKWELL: I think, by and large, today in the City of Windsor, those who work there could do with a little more diversified industry than the big motor plants, to depend upon solely for employment.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) name an industry that did not locate in Winnipeg after the strike of 1919?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman—

MR. JOLLIFFE: We did not think you could.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I have emphasized what the position of the police is. I have never heard anything more absurd than that a Police Act should delegate away from the policing authority, and thus restrict to conciliation the direction of proper police action in the maintenance of law and order.

I have to say in relation to both subsections of the amendment that neither one are acceptable to the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question, question.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Chairman, there are two or three matters here it seems to me the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has overlooked. This afternoon when dealing with previous sections, namely 48 and 49, we were told very distinctly by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that "where commissioners may request the services of the Ontario Provincial Police Force"—what was meant there, the special branch of the force—to be called in. Now, we have a suggested sub-amendment or two subsections by way

of amendment, which says that, in effect, we should continue to carry out the system that has been in vogue up to this time in regard to 49 (1). What he says is that the electors should be consulted by the Crown Attorney in the case and that they should be appraised of the situation and they should take some responsibility in bringing in a detachment or a section of the provincial police force in industrial dispute situations.

Now, it is true that those elected municipal authorities must live with the situation, not only during the time of the industrial dispute, but after that time, and from there on in. It is true also that the elected responsible authority must be assuming the responsibility on behalf of the citizens, not for the trade unionists alone, but all sections of the community, because they are going to pay for the detachments.

MR. BLACKWELL: They have never paid a cent in Ontario—not a single cent.

MR. MILLARD: Your Act says they may be called on to pay.

MR. BLACKWELL: They have never been asked to pay a cent.

MR. MILLARD: What I am suggesting to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and to the hon. members of this House is that Section 49 (a-1) is an entirely reasonable approach. It places responsibility where the responsibility ought to be. I would think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) would welcome the fact that he does not want to depend for his information on a single individual, just one, a Crown Attorney, an appointee, a person who may not assume the proper responsibility in a given situation of this kind, and that is what he is asking us to do, if he rejects 49 (a-1). We are asking that the responsible authority should be consulted, and should put in the request, if needed. That is what we have been doing up to the present time. We understood this afternoon, when the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) was speaking, that the intention in 48 (1) was not to upset the present situation, but it was to deal with cases where they wanted to invite in more than one extra, regarding the various branches of the service. Now we find out it is to deal with an industrial situation that 48 (1) is aimed at, because if it is not, the section before us by way of an amendment would be acceptable.

Section 2 of the proposed amendment; I agree with the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) that there is a lot of advantage. It is not as the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) suggested a moment ago, for going in to direct the police force. What it says is they shall advise those in charge of the police force. I know of situations, and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) knows of a situation right here in the City of Toronto, in Leaside, where they would have been a lot better off—both the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and the police force—if they had had somebody from the Department of Labour who could have advised them what action they should take. They could have saved themselves a lot of difficulty and a lot of needless disruption in that particular situation.

MR. BLACKWELL: I cannot agree with you.

MR. MILLARD: You agreed when you were talking to another individual, not in this House.

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh no, I did not.

MR. MILLARD: You did, when you were talking to Mr. Murray Cottrell.

MR. BLACKWELL: Oh no. I will tell you the substance of that discussion later. I do not want to interrupt you now.

MR. MILLARD: The substance of the conversation was that you recognized there had been mistakes made both on the part of the employers and the police in that situation, and that they had not handled it very well.

MR. FROST: Can we not agree to disagree?

MR. MILLARD: I hope I am not talking at too great length, but I am speaking in the hope that I can convince the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). We are not asking the government to back down; we are asking the government to accept the advice of people involved in this situation, and I think we would save ourselves a lot of difficulty in the future if we would be willing to accept these two amendments.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I might mention what transpired between Mr. Murray Cottrell and myself, because I think the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) will agree it reflected no discredit on either of us, under those circumstances. The fact was that a lot of people had come into that municipality. I do not know what gave them the idea, but they came in, and it was quite apparent from the information I had from the Department of Labour that there was every prospect of the matter being settled on the following Monday. I called Mr. Cottrell informally, and I had a chat with him, and I suggested he go up and see that nothing happened. He did suggest to me a process I could not accept. I was anxious to consider any reasonable proposal that might govern, but I could not accept what he actually wanted to have done, which was have the police see that a person going into the plant talked to pickets. That is not a policeman's function. His only function is to see, on the one hand, if people are willing to be talked to by the pickets, that they have that right, and, on the other hand, if they do not want to be stopped, that they have the right to go on unmolested.

I can give you one example of that, and perhaps it is a very important one. That was during the first seamen's strike. The violence which took place was very detrimental to the union, and I feel that later on they did their best to get it under control, because they were winning the strike hands down wherever there was peaceful picketing. On the wharves the police were, despite the hollering of management—and they did holler—the police were there and they saw that every place a ship docked, the pickets had an opportunity of speaking to people, both on and off the boats. I think that is a good example, and I do wish to say that the police force, in their efforts throughout these occurrences, have acted very impartially.

As the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) knows very well, incidents have not been too numerous in this province, when there was any real issue of that kind. The number of efforts to operate lines of steamships or operate a company under those circumstances have been quite limited, and every time that situation arises, all I can say is there is the law. It is not made by municipal councillors; it is made by the Parliament of Canada, and the Attorney-General's department of the province, as constituted at present, is responsible for the administration of the law, and the question cannot be determined in this province by political means, and as far as I am concerned, so long as I am in the office, I will fairly and equitably and as equitably as I can enforce the laws of the country.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) if it is not true under that second subsection, when you were in charge of the situation, at Windsor you had the advice of people from the Labour Department of the dominion and you got the police out in that situation, in order that the thing could be righted?

MR. BLACKWELL: Not on their advice.

MR. MILLARD: You had the Department of Labour officials with you.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will be only a moment, Mr. Chairman. I wish to refer to an example which goes back before the days of the present hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) was in office.

MR. BLACKWELL: I cannot take the responsibility for that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is why I am going back, so you can consider it im-

personally. Shortly before the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) took office, I happened to go to the City of Galt, as counsel for a union engaged in a number of strikes there. The first occasion on which I went there was for the purpose of making certain that notices issued by the Labour Court, which was then in existence under the Act of 1943, would be duly posted within certain plants which had been struck.

When I arrived I found that the provincial police were already there, and naturally I entered into conversation with them about this and about some other matters, and I was surprised to learn just how bewildered their officers were about the whole situation. I remember very well that the inspector in command of that detachment, whose name I do not remember, but it does not matter, was at a loss to know whether the notices which had been issued by the Labour Court of Ontario, which was a division of the Supreme Court at that time, should be or could be posted within the plants, although it had been duly ordered by a judge of the Supreme Court that they should be.

I am not saying this by way of criticism, but I am pointing out in that particular strike situation, the officer in command of a large body of provincial police was completely at sea as to what his duties were, and what the rights of the company were, and what the rights of the union were. I found myself in the position of having to explain to him what the Labour Court was, what the judge's order was all about, and what had to be done, and eventually he accepted the information I gave him, it occurred to me at that time it would have been far better if some provincial officer could have been on the spot to advise him as to what the situation was, and I think what these amendments seek to do is to ensure there will be in situations of this kind a representative of the Department of Labour, who will know what it is all about, and will be able to give impartial advice to the officer commanding the Provincial Police at that particular place.

Now, one other incident took place in Galt, to which I think I might refer. The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) has correctly said, in strike situations a very large number of hopeless prosecutions are launched. This happens repeatedly and it happened in Galt, and in that case it was merely because of the indignation of the government about strikes and for no other reason I can see, prosecutions that had no hope whatever were launched.

MR. BLACKWELL: Where was that?

MR. JOLLIFFE: In Galt, in 1943. I will give an example. The former member for Ontario, who is now a member of Parliament for Ontario, was in Galt at the time and he and a number of strikers undertook to picket a certain plant on a Saturday morning. One of the points involved in picketing the plant on a Saturday morning was that this plant was on a 5-day week, and there could be no possible question of a clash with strike-breakers or people seeking to enter the plant to go to work on a Saturday morning. Now, ludicrous though it may seem, the provincial police undertook to make a test case against Mr. Williams on the basis that there could not be a picket line outside a plant with more than six members on a Saturday morning when the plant was not operating.

MR. BLACKWELL: Was that not a ludicrous thing to do?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Maybe, but it was done. I will tell you why it was done. It was done because the officer in charge there made a statement that you could not picket any plant, no matter how big it may be, with more than six people. He was told, therefore, "We will picket a plant on a Saturday morning with more than six people and if you think that is the law we will find out in court." So we did go to court about it, and I need hardly say that the prosecution failed.

What the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is not taking into account is the extraordinarily high percentages of these prosecutions which do fail because

they have never had a hope of success, because they were launched wholly for the purpose of breaking the morale of the people striking. On some other counts I think we should give the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) a memorandum on the hopeless prosecutions that have been launched during a strike for reasons which he knows and reasons which are abundantly clear.

We know there are cases where police intervention is necessary. We know there are certain cases where things happen which ought not to happen, but it does not follow that because these clashes have occurred in some places at certain times, it does not follow that the provincial police would not benefit through the advice and assistance of an officer of the Department of Labour who knows something about labour relations and sometimes about taking care of a strike and something about the personalities involved. It certainly does not follow that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) or the provincial police can afford to do without the advice of the local municipal authorities.

Motion negatived.

Sections 49 to 51, inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 50.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman—

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is an amendment there, is there not?

MR. BLACKWELL: That is what I am rising about. In the fourth line there are four underlined words, "of the whole or any part," referring to the municipality. I move that amendment, that is the underlining.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think we will fight with you about that.

Sections 52 to 60, inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 61.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this section may we have a few words from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) on this subject? It seems to me to be very important. If the reliability, quality and efficiency of the police is probably going to depend to a very large extent on just how far this proposal will take us, I suggest that it would be appropriate for the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to say a word or two about it.

MR. BLACKWELL: I think, Mr. Chairman, I indicated that when I resumed the debate on second reading, after the adjournment. What we have in mind of doing departmentally is to establish with representatives of the municipalities consultations and conferences with a view to reaching standards by that process, rather than taking the risk of advancing them in the first place by regulations. In a province where there are so many diverse duties, as in the Province of Ontario, that is where we have proceeded in our evolution of stepping up police responsibilities in the province over the last six years, and we have done that in co-operation and with good feeling between the department and the municipalities, generally speaking. We intend to proceed with that in the same atmosphere.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, then, in other words, this suggestion that it is a "college" is a bit optimistic. There is quite a difference between a "college" and a "conference." If I understood the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) correctly, he used the word "conference," that is different from a college for training.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am very sorry, I completely misunderstood the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), for which I must express my regrets. I felt that we had come to the regulation section. You want a general expression of attitude?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I am sorry, I was referring to 61, the Police College.

MR. BLACKWELL: Quite. We have in mind there, first the obtaining of the requisite amount of space in Ajax, with dormitory accommodations, where meals can be provided so that the police

officers of municipalities may have that accommodation, and from an expense point of view, make attendance at the school possible. Correspondingly, in order to enable them to leave the municipality, where the size of the local police force does not lend itself to that, what we propose there is to loan them, by way of a substitution for a time, one of the officers at the school, a provincial police officer. In other words, the project we are trying to undertake is to co-operate as much as possible to bring up the standards of the qualifications for existing police officers in the province, those that already have jobs. And now, in addition to that, there will be two types of courses for the ordinary police officers, and there will be the type of course that goes with police executives; there will be also the type of course that goes with crime detection, for the detectives. I hope that gives some picture of how we hope to get going.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Could you give them a course in industrial relations?

Section 61 agreed to.

On Section 62.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Section 62. It is all right to carry these things in the same breath with which you bring up the section, but we have not springs in our chairs. What I have to bring up, and I think this is the spot to bring it up, earlier in the debate his afternoon, the hon. member for Temiskaming (Mr. Taylor) raised the question of—

MR. BLACKWELL: A little louder, please.

MR. WISMER: Earlier this afternoon, the hon. member for Temiskaming (Mr. Taylor) brought up the question of how grievances were handled as between constables of the Ontario Provincial Police Force and the authorities. Now, I understand that the police are gradually becoming members of the Civil Servants Association, and some of the process of reasonable and regular negotiations departmentalized and so on is becoming more possible. What I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is, has a fairly complete system either been developed, or is it in the process of being developed, whereby the ordinary constable who has grievances can bring these into a regular channel to the authorities and have his grievances either dismissed as of no importance, or looked after when it is of importance, without the ordinary suggestions which we hear that even his associates cannot appear on his behalf without being concerned about their own personal position.

MR. BLACKWELL: I do not, of course, accept that proposition at all. I have never encountered any evidence that this was so. As I understand it, when a provincial policeman is charged with any offence under the code, he has to be charged with it in writing, the hearing is under oath. I have examined evidence of some of these hearings, and I have never encountered any members of the Force coming forward and giving evidence on either side and having to worry about their positions. As I said, the final disposition of the matter at that stage is by the way of recommendation and having regard to the nature of the police force, I feel that is an efficient and sound method of handling it. As a matter of fact, if the discipline and procedure of the municipal boards of the province were developed to the same extent, which I wish they were, I feel particularly in the smaller municipalities the policeman could go about his task without political and other interference as is sometimes the case. As a matter of fact, in that respect, in a case where we feel there has been some interference in the Municipal Force if we could have evidence in a court, we would have them charged. That is, the members of the municipal council. Unfortunately, although you can get a formal statement, when you want people to go into court they are not prepared to do so.

MR. WISMER: I am happy to have that explanation, but I am not talking about offences. I am talking about

grievances. In other words, where a constable is not satisfied with his wages or working conditions, and one thing and another in a man's ordinary working life he is not satisfied about. Sometimes, if I may use the word, "grousing" about something that does not amount to anything. In case he has a real, solid complaint, I understand there is no normal channel in which that can be taken up. What I am interested in is whether there is some provision now, or whether perhaps the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) may tell us if there is some way of processing grievances which will be put into effect. I mean, after all, just to make this clear, if there were a trade union these things would be taken up; when these people have no one to help them, what process is available?

MR. BLACKWELL: We do not contemplate, in relation to Provincial Police, a collective bargaining process. I do not feel I should leave any impression that we do. The Provincial Police are under their own code, and they are under what are practically statutory schedules of pay. Their increments come forward, ever since this government has been in office, they come forward on the annual basis and that situation lends itself practically automatically. Now, in the matter of the force moving around where it is desired for them to go in Ontario, and they as Provincial Police, when they entered into the Force, undertook to go where they are told and so on. I can assure you I am not going to get that force into the situation where it is going to be ordered about by a series of meetings.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): May I ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) whether a Provincial Police Force in a municipality, who are they responsible to—the municipality authorities or the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). Under whose direction are they while they are there?

MR. BLACKWELL: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is that they should not be under the direction of individual members of a municipality. As a matter of fact, it is really an offence by a member of a municipal council to order a policeman, to prevent him from doing his job fully. He is not a servant of the municipality, he is an officer of the Crown, and he has certain responsibilities and he is not allowed to disregard the enforcement of the law. Therefore, he is not under the direction of a municipal council and never has been.

MR. SALSBERG: He is under your direction?

MR. BLACKWELL: No, essentially he is under the direction of the people that are elected to the Parliament of Canada and make the criminal laws of the country.

MR. SALSBERG: But you, as Attorney-General—

MR. ELLIS: That is the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is it not?

MR. L. F. K. FELL (CCF Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, you may rule me out of order on this, but there is a point raised this afternoon, and at the time it was raised it seemed to me the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) had clarified the question I had in mind. However, in going over the sections it appears the question is in my mind again, and it conflicts with what I thought the explanation was this afternoon. I would refer to Section 56 for a moment.

This afternoon, I believe there was a question directed to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) as to what process is necessary in the dismissal of a constable from the force, and unless I am mistaken, I believe I understood at that time the answer was that a constable could not be dismissed from the forces without the authorization of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell).

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): That is right.

MR. FELL: Well now, is this in dispute with that statement—Section 46, which reads:

"The Commissioner may suspend or dismiss from office any constable heretofore appointed under The Constable's Act."

MR. BLACKWELL: That is not our police. That, I believe, has to do with the old set-up of county constables which used to exist throughout the province. That system has largely disappeared today. Not quite, but largely.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are not your men?

Sections 62 to 65 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 108 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I beg to inform the House, his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to hon. members of the House.

Order No. 29.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 29, by Mr. Frost,

Resolved,

1. That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council be authorized to raise from time to time by way of loan such sum or sums of money as may be deemed expedient for any or all of the following purposes, that is to say: For the public service, for works carried on by commissioners on behalf of Ontario, for discharging any indebtedness or obligation of Ontario or for reimbursing the Consolidated Revenue Fund for any moneys expended in discharging any such indebtedness or obligation, and for the carrying on of the public works authorized by the Legislature; provided that the principal amount of any securities issued and the amount of any temporary loans raised under the authority of the bill, An Act for raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, including any securities issued for the retirement of the said securities or temporary loans, at any time outstanding, shall not exceed in the whole one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000).

2. That the aforesaid sum of money may be borrowed for any term or terms not exceeding 40 years, at such rate as may be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and shall be raised upon the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Ontario, and shall be chargeable thereupon.

3. That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may provide for a special sinking fund with respect to the issue herein authorized, and such sinking fund may be at a greater rate than the one-half of one per centum per annum specified in Subsection 3 of Section 3 of The Provincial Loans Act.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Is this figure the same as it was in last year's bill?

MR. FROST: I cannot say as to that. It is to meet the conditions this year. I think it was the same last year. What is $100,000,000 to our friends anyway?

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): What is $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 one way or the other?

MR. FROST: With respect to Order No. 32, I see that is not reprinted. Possibly it may be in the books now. If Bill 104 has been printed—

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): It is on our desks now.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): It is one of the bills which went to The Municipal Law Committee, and I think it has just been distributed.

MR. FROST: We will take Order No. 33, then. I am sorry, I see No. 104 is here. Do you want to hold 104 over? It has been through Municipal Committee.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I think in view of the fact it has been through the Municipal Law Committee, the government had better go ahead with it.

MR. FROST: All right, Order No. 32, then.

ASSESSMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 32nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 104, "An Act to amend The Assessment Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 104 reported.

MR. FROST: Order No. 33.

PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 33rd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 130 reported.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): We are making time now.

MR. FROST: 34th Order.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 34th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 131 reported.

MR. FROST: 35th Order.

MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 35th Order: House in Committee on Bill No. 133, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 26 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 133 reported.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): I hope the hon. Leader of the House (Mr. Frost) will not accuse us of "lying in ambush" again, because we let these bills go through this way.

MR. FROST: You never can tell. You have to watch it.

36th Order.

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 140, "An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 140 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): I think that is the works. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report certain bills with and certain bills without amendment, and a resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain bills with amendment and certain bills without amendment and a resolution; and move the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply. That is, unless my hon. friends have another "ambush" on.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Could be.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): We know nothing of ambushes.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): We let you get into one.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): The Department of the Provincial Treasurer; page 89, Vote 146.

On Vote 146:

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, before we leave Vote No. 146, I would just like to say a word. I do not wish to dwell on the item of $12,000, again, except to say this, that I have two observations to make; the one is that in my opinion it would seem to me irregular for the Legislative Council to order, and for the Provincial Auditor to accept the order, that a salary of $10,000 each provided by statutes be reduced simply by a stroke of the pen. It seems to me that when we were in Public Accounts Committee we were told that the Provincial Auditor had not been subject to any dictates by any member of the Executive Council or by anyone else; and, personally, I would not like to see him placed in the position in which he would be subject to dictation or suggestions by any hon. member of the Cabinet.

It seems to me if this is going to be done right, it should be done in either one of two ways, namely, that the statutory order itself be amended to reduce it from $10,000 to $8,000, or that hon. members of the Cabinet maintain their courage in spite of the opposition which has come from this side, and hold the item at the statutory figure at which it is now held.

However, Mr. Chairman, this is not the vote to which I would like to draw major attention, but rather to the item of $5,000 which appears in Vote No. 146 under the heading of "Dominion-Provincial Conference, $5,000," because I feel this is an opportunity, or possibly the only opportunity I might have to discuss this matter.

Like the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), I, too, have "gone into a huddle" with "Old Man Ontario," and I find he is very much grieved indeed, and is appalled to find the lack of effort on the part of this government to enter into an agreement with the Dominion Government for its share of what is coming to it under the dominion-provincial plan.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Does my hon. friend (Mr. Brown) know that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. St. Laurent, said that he had neither the time nor the patience to sit in with us in conference? What can we do?

MR. BROWN: You can do plenty.

MR. FROST: We are waiting for the election of the Drew government some time this year, and then we are going to consider this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BROWN: I am afraid you will have to wait a long time. I happen to know full well all you need to do is send a letter to Ottawa and submit, the same as the other seven provinces—

MR. FROST: Send a letter down there and surrender, you mean?

MR. BROWN: Surrendering, of course.

MR. FROST: We do not do business that way.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): And we just took a voluntary reduction.

MR. BROWN: I am going to point out to you, briefly, why I think you should surrender. "Old Man Ontario" knows the Province of Ontario is unnecessarily sucking approximately $22,000,000 annually from the lifeblood of provincial industry each year that it does not enter into an agreement with the Dominion Government. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) referred the other day before the orders of the day—

MR. FROST: It is only fair to say Mr. Abbott's Budget is going to suck about another $8,000,000—the Budget of yesterday—from the same industry you are so solicitous for.

MR. BROWN: I understood the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to say —I wonder if I could just finish what I have to say without all these interruptions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

MR. BROWN: He suggested the Province of Ontario would lose approximately $6,000,000, at the cost of increasing taxation which would come only from the large corporations of the Province of Ontario, but I say that is taking $22,000,000 each year from industry by the extra taxes which these corporations have to pay, which means a net amount of some $16,000,000.

However, this is not the major item. It is this, that distinctly apart from the unnecessary drain on industry, the amount recoverable to the Province of Ontario for the year 1949-50 would be in the neighbourhood of $87,000,000, whereas the amount in the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) budget for the same period is approximately $75,000,000, or a loss to this province of $12,000,000.

In the year 1950 to 1951 the Estimates for the Federal Government is approximately $93,000,000, whereas the amount in the provincial Budget at that time cannot likely exceed, for the current year, more than the same amount as in the previous year, which would result in a loss of a further $18,000,000. I say that, unless the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) wishes to embark upon the imposition of personal income taxes, which I would say would be political suicide, so to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: For them, you mean.

MR. BROWN: All this, Mr. Chairman, based on a question of autonomy, a question of provincial rights. It seems to me it is indeed a terrific price to pay. I am sure there is not a private member in this House who would not humble himself to the point of a small sacrifice in provincial autonomy—if such so exists, and I am not convinced that it does—in order to obtain for the benefit of the people of this province such additional amounts as $12,000,000 for the year in which we are now entering, and $18,000,000 for the next succeeding year, or a total of $30,000,000.

Think what can be done with this money. Grants, not just of $5,000 or $10,000 for the community centres, but these grants, plus $1.00 per head of population in a municipality, could be granted for the community centres, thus giving places like the City of Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, and even Kitchener, a proper break on such grants.

Old age pensions could be placed on a basis of $40 per month, for all those eligible, together with further contributions in the case of need; a housing plan on a considerably more liberal basis for the creation of low-rental homes in this province; a return of the hog subsidy to the farmers of Ontario; and all this at no extra cost, no extra expense—

MR. FROST: May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Brown) what hat did he pull this $30,000,000 out of, that he is talking about? Is this the $30,000,000 you spoke of in your budget address?

MR. BROWN: No, I am projecting it now one more year into the future, and I am giving you a chance to go to the Dominion Government before it is too late—

MR. J. L. McDONALD (PC Stormont): Where would they get the money?

MR. BROWN: Because I think this could be done.

All this could have been done at no added expense to the people of the Province of Ontario because it could come from the Dominion of Canada through, as the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has pointed out in his own budget address, from the broad taxing powers of the Dominion of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Where would they get it?

MR. BROWN: From their broad taxing powers.

I do therefore believe that the government should negotiate immediately with the Dominion Government for the benefits so that the benefits to which I have

referred may become available. We have, no doubt, lost the opportunity, due to the lapse of time, to recover the $12,000,000, which could have been available to the people of this province for 1948 and 1949. But, do not let us be foolish enough to procrastinate for another year because I do not think Old Man Ontario will like it.

HON. MR. FROST: I might say this about "Old Man Ontario." There was an election this year in Ontario and Quebec, and both of them supported the government that stood up for the rights of the people.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): A minority vote.

MR. BROWN: I think we should have a word from the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) about the $5,000. Whether we can expect an appearance or not.

HON. MR. FROST: I would say we put that amount in last year and then Rt. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent came around and dashed our hopes to the ground by saying he had neither the time nor the inclination to discuss things with us and we were going to leave it out of the budget, but then Mr. Drew went down to Ottawa and there was an election coming along and we felt so sure about a Drew victory, we put it back in again.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): From what I have heard about 146, ss. 5, I draw your attention to ss. 6, a vote of $10,000 for historical sites, monuments and records. I think we might put 5 and 6 together and let the $15,000 all go along.

HON. MR. FROST: We are thinking of building a monument to Mr. Mackenzie King.

Vote No. 146. Carried.

On vote 147.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): In connection with 147, the Bureau of Statistics and Research, this I believe is the bureau under which the recent survey was made.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have in view the thought and time and work on the preparation and publication of these books. Speaking for myself, I find them very valuable and very useful.

A question I would like to ask is this, to what extent is this bureau geared in with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Is there in effect a liaison?

HON. MR. FROST: Complete co-operation and collaboration.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE: Leader of the Opposition, Both ways?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes. The dominion high-hat us a little bit.

Vote 147 carried.

On Vote 148.

HON. MR. FROST: Carried.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 148, I am surprised to hear the Hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) say, "Carried." When I advised him about a week ago, I intended to ask a question about that vote.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): It is a long time ago and we forgot.

MR. SALSBERG: The item deals with the Motion Picture Censorship and Theatre Inspection.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that we in this province are confronted with a developing situation that is truly alarming. I get the impression that the Motion Picture Censorship Branch of this Department has become a dictatorial power, responsible to itself, and that it has set itself up as a sort of thought-control agency in this province. It decides what the people shall see and what they shall not see; they determine what is good for you and what is bad for you. They also brought into their activities—

HON. MR. FROST: Would my hon. friend please be specific and tell me what he is complaining about?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Give him a chance.

HON. MR. FROST: There is nothing to be gained by making these sweeping statements.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: As I was saying, they are broadening out their activities, putting in 16-millimetre and other moving pictures that were used for educational purposes, and as an illustration, to prove the correctness of my charge and cause for alarm, is the action of the Board in the case of a documentary film produced in the United States and banned in this province by the Motion Board.

The documentary is known by the name of "Native Land." That film depicts—and I have seen it—it depicts the battle of the people in America, particularly the workers and the poor farmers for civil liberties and for the ordinary elementary rights of the people.

The reason given by the Censorship Board, I am advised, is that the picture is too American, if you please. One would imagine it was a propaganda picture for the United States imperialism. I imagine if it were that it would be welcome and displayed very prominently.

This Censorship Board has nothing to say about a lot of moronic pictures from the United States that are allowed to flood motion picture houses.

HON. MR. FROST: Such as?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: I have yet to hear that they stopped or banned any of these crime pictures, or where they have banned any of these salacious pictures.

HON. MR. FROST: Name the pictures you think should have been banned.

MR. SALSBERG: You name those they banned. All I can say is they are allowing the province to be flooded—

HON. MR. FROST: Can my friend name a picture?

MR. SALSBERG: I say, you name the pictures they stopped.

HON. MR. FROST: No, no.

MR. SALSBERG: You know, church people and educators and other groups find occasion to protest time and again—

HON. MR. FROST: Name one picture and I will try and give you the background.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not have to name a picture they allowed in because it is up to you to prove that they stopped any of these bad pictures from coming in. They do not have to allow them to flow freely. They stopped a picture documentary that is called "Native Land," that deals with the struggle of the workers and their rights to organize.

HON. MR. FROST: May I just set my hon. friend's mind at ease? I would be very glad to help him. Now that he has mentioned that, I might say, "Native Land" has never been submitted to the Censor Board. If my friend will bring "Native Land" to the Censor Board tomorrow, I will arrange to have it censored and, furthermore, I will not only take the actual Censor Board, but I will take a cross section of members of this House, who can sit in with the Censors, and review the picture, and if it is passed by the Board and the committee, we will be glad to have it shown.

MR. SALSBERG: This is so serious a matter.

HON. MR. FROST: Well, it has not been censored.

MR. SALSBERG: You looked at a note. I am glad to hear you make this statement.

HON. MR. PORTER: You were charging the Censor Board.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister of Education does not have to help the hon. Treasurer. He is more able than you to defend the government. He

is the only one there that can get away with things.

HON. MR. PORTER: We do not get away with as much as you do.

MR. SALSBERG: Do not let me interfere in your inner struggles, I do not want to, but I advised the hon. Treasurer well in advance that I meant to raise the question so that he would be prepared to answer.

HON. MR. FROST: Can I do any more for you? Nine o'clock in the morning, and it is half-past nine now. I will have them ready at nine o'clock in the morning, and arrange for a committee, hon. members of this House, if they want to be up at that hour, and censor your picture and see what is in it.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Treasurer has made a statement in reply to the charge that this documentary was banned. I am glad to hear that he is arranging for a re-examination.

HON. MR. FROST: No, no; I have never had it. It has never been sent up.

MR. SALSBERG: I want to inform the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) it is not my picture. He does not have to ask me to bring my picture for review. It is not mine.

HON. MR. PORTER: It was not banned.

MR. SALSBERG: It was.

HON. MR. FROST: No, no.

MR. SALSBERG: This matter was brought to the attention of the labour bodies. There was a resolution adopted by the Labour Council in Toronto, asking me to promote the showing of this picture.

HON. MR. FROST: Let me say to my hon. friend, the picture has never been banned. The picture has never been sent up for censoring. If it is presented and sent up for censoring, we will censor it as quickly as possible. I cannot do any more than that.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (CCF Bracondale): May I ask a question?

MR. SALSBERG: I will permit the hon. member (Mr. Walters) to ask a question.

MR. WALTERS: If this picture was not banned, why was the resolution brought up in the Toronto Labour Council protesting when they appealed for the use of the picture and told they could not use the picture because it was banned?

HON. MR. FROST: No, no. The answer is quite reasonable and logical. We show pictures in Ontario. In this particular case the sponsors of the picture stated they wanted to show this film publicly and privately and authorized the proceeds would be apportioned to certain charitable purposes. Now, Mr. Chairman, you cannot allow people to show pictures in the province without complying with the law, and that is why they should be passed by the Censor Board. If the film is presented, I can assure my hon. friend it will be censored at once, but not only that, but I will take a cross-section of this House, or a cross-section of any representative citizens of the community and add them to the board and let them censor the picture.

MR. SALSBERG: I shall pass on the information of the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to the people concerned. I just want to say, though, that I have every confidence in the people who brought this information, it was a matter that was discussed publicly. I think there was an editorial on that question in one of the Toronto daily papers, and I might say the picture has been approved and has been shown in British Columbia and in one other Western Province, and in Saskatchewan. At least, it has been used by the Department of Labour, if you please, in showings to many organized workers of that province. It is a film that has been passed by everybody from the *New York Times* to Walter Winchell as being one of the most dramatic pictures of the struggle of the American people and because it is of such a character this Censor Board decides it is too American.

I want to say, regardless of what will happen to this picture—and I do hope it will be released—that the people of the province will have an opportunity of seeing it. Generally speaking, there is a tendency on the part of the Motion Picture Censorship Board to act in a dictatorial manner.

We have had occasion to discuss it here during the estimates in the past. I cannot recall exactly the problems I raised some four or five years ago, coming from this item, but we had quite an exchange at that time, and I understood things eased up a little. Now the Board is again acting up.

I would like, in addition to the assurance the Hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has given the House, to hear from the Hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) how people in this province could appeal and who they can appeal to against the rulings or regulations of this Board. What redress have we got? How can we lodge an appeal?

HON. MR. FROST: Would my hon. friend be satisfied with an appeal to me? Do you think I would treat them fairly and reasonably?

MR. SALSBERG: Well, Mr. Chairman, privately I would trust the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) with a lot of things. I would even go to him with complaints, but when he acts for this government, I am conscious that he is acting for a Tory administration which would cause me to hesitate.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say to my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) that this is what happens in an appeal—I get them occasionally and I have two appeals for two matters that have been treated as appeals.

What I do if there is an appeal from the decision of the Censor Board, is to take a cross-section of people who are interested. I have at times appointed members from this House as a board of censors. Here is a particular case. I appointed . . .

MR. SALSBERG: Am I on the panel?

MR. FROST: No, you are not on this one.

MR. SALSBERG: You are partial.

MR. FROST: I appointed here 24 or 25 representative citizens. In this case the Chairman was the Director of the Health League of Canada, and I appointed about 25 representative citizens. I had them sit in, look at the picture, review it and I accepted their statements. That is the way I have treated appeals. I have tried to have a representative cross-section.

MR. SALSBERG: Have you labour people on that panel?

MR. FROST: I would say they are such people as this; Health League of Canada, Christian Social Council of Canada, United Church of Canada. Being a United churchman, I cannot see much wrong with that. Down here is the Catholic League of Decency, Presbyterian Church, Toronto Board of Education, Toronto General Hospital, professors from Toronto University. Now . . .

MR. SALSBERG: Why do not you include the Labour Councils?

MR. FROST: There is a great long list. There are all sorts of people here.

AN HON. MEMBER: What was the picture?

MR. FROST: It was one of those—

MR. SALSBERG: American pictures?

MR. FROST: However, that is the way an appeal is treated.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): I was waiting for this little exchange to get completed, because I would like to discuss this vote from quite a different angle. I know the way it works. Probably the only complaint I have to make about the censorship, after all, bringing it to Leaside, it is quite—

MR. FROST: I might say it was also quite a fire-hazard down here, and to the employees in this building.

MR. WISMER: Now, Mr. Chairman, the first question in regard to this, that I would like to discuss for a moment, is the theatre inspection. My understanding is there are only five inspectors to inspect theatres in 13 areas of the province, which means that the theatres in the province, outside of Toronto are inspected not more than twice a year. In Toronto, I gather, inspection amounts to sometimes three times a year.

MR. FROST: It is quite unfair for my friend to say that. It is just nonsense to speak that way. It is quite true our inspectors cover the province two or three times a year, but here, in the City of Toronto, all these things are inspected by the local Fire Department, by the Fire Chief and by other agencies, and that happens in every town. Actually speaking, our theatres are well-inspected and well taken care of. It is true we run across difficulties sometimes, but it is remarkable how few difficulties—

MR. WISMER: That is very interesting. But I think it is important to note that over and over again we are noticing that children—one being found asleep in a theatre, being in theatres they are not supposed to be in, because of the class of entertainment, and I give credit to the government that they have a regulation for theatres to indicate whether for adults or for general audiences. But, having done so, is it possible to make inspections—I know it is quite easy for a child to have an adult buy the ticket. Once the ticket is purchased, the child has to go past a ticket-taker. The ticket-taker could stop the child. If the ticket-taker does not, the child gets on into the theatre. Now, we have all the regulations, but, unfortunately, we have only a few inspectors. I offer it as a serious consideration to the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost), if we are going to have a certain class of pictures shown, because the very fine censorship that goes on—I give him credit for the type of people that he calls in where there is a question in his mind. I know it is government policy to call in representative panels of people and they make the decision, but, having made that decision, on a certain type of picture, it should not be shown to children. The job then is to keep the children out of the theatres and the only way that can be done is by tightening up the inspection. In other words, it is not just a question of fair inspection.

The next point I would like to deal with is that in relation to the 16-millimeter film censorship. There are 16-millimeter films available, but, unfortunately, there is, I believe, no regulation governing the issue of 16-millimeters, as there are regulations governing the issuing of 35-millimeters, and one of the reasons there are not regulations is because 16-millimeter is fireproof, as against the non-proof of 35.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) knows this: there are many 16-millimeter theatres in little communities throughout the province and, in those cases there is inspection and there is censorship, but there obviously is, in the cases of pictures shown in the churches and other places. The regulations are not . . .

MR. WISMER: Just so we will be very clear on this; I do not want to get mixed up in the showing of 16-millimeters as, for instance, the National Film Board, which is a marvellous service, and I am not talking about the showing of 16-millimeters shown whether obtained from the National Film Board or elsewhere. In the urban areas the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) knows there is an arrangement whereby you cannot show any more 16-millimeter films within a radius of ten miles of a 35-millimeter film.

MR. FROST: Actually that is not a regulation of the department.

MR. WISMER: I know it is not. It is a deal that exists in the trade.

MR. FROST: You take, for instance, up here on Avenue Road, there is the Glendale Theatre. These people go in there, and they put in a very fine service and a very fine theatre for the people

of that community. Well, it is rather tough for them to go and put opposition in the form of 16-millimeters within perhaps a certain distance of the place.

MR. WISMER: There are two sides to this story, and, on the one side there are two angles, and I want to deal with them. What I am going to bring this up for is that I think the government should start doing something about it. Not only to break the monopoly—not only that, but, on the 16-millimeter film you have available educational pictures, better pictures for children, and there are people who are prepared to provide commercially that kind of film and that kind of entertainment in, not only larger centres, but in some small centres.

MR. FROST: I want to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Wismer) it is quite incorrect to say there is a hard and fast rule. That ten-mile area, actually that is not true. I can give you places where there are 16-millimeter pictures being shown in small picture theatres. It depends on the circumstances of the case, and I am bound to say this, the main picture operators have been most reasonable about that and if there are cases that my friend (Mr. Wismer) has in mind, let me have them.

MR. WISMER: I have a case in—

MR. FROST: "You come and see me sometime," like Mae West.

MR. WISMER: All right, you slip off all these things by "come up to see me, sometime."

The main picture industry presumably has a perfect right to protect its own interests. No doubt about that. They are having considerable trouble these days. But the ordinary public families with children would like to see more of the type of entertainment that is now being carried on in the 16-millimeter than in the 35 millimeter film. I notice smaller centres where there is one theatre, 35-millimeter theatre—and people are prepared to have showings of 16-millimeter films with those better programmes, I suggest if the—

MR. FROST: Is not it a matter of common sense? Let me give you an example. Take for instance one of the big main picture concerns produce a very expensive film—probably millions of dollars put into the production of the film. They do run off some 16 millimeter films. Can you ask those people who are putting millions of dollars in a proposition of that sort to compete with themselves. They cannot possibly make any money out of it by providing competition for themselves from the 16 millimeter film. Of course what they do is this; they provide the 35 millimeter films in places where they can show them, and they are out to make money. You cannot blame them for that. In places that cannot show them, and is within a distance that there is not competition for their theatres, they show the other pictures. It is only common sense. What can you do about it?

MR. WISMER: I will say to the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) I am quite aware of the new development of the Children's Film Library.

MR. FROST: Oh, a tremendous development.

MR. WISMER: They have 25 possibly, in Canada so far. Only just started this year, and it has developed in the right direction, but that does not slip off the argument. You take small places where you have one theatre in the Province of Ontario, showing 35 millimeter, and because of this 10-mile radius arrangement, you cannot show the 16 millimeter programme even once a week.

Now, I suggest to the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that all that is required is some regulation.

MR. FROST: After all, let us be reasonable about this. Go back into the southern end of my riding, back in Haliburton, Haliburton Village has a very nice theatre and so has Minden and Gelert, Wilberforce—all erected since the administration of this government raised the prosperity and standard of that country. There are nice theatres there. Let me give you an example.

Those places are showing 35 millimeter. A few miles away there are little communities, and in those little communities hydro has been put in the last year, and in the little community hall they show 16 millimeter pictures.

Now, you can see that is the purpose of it. In addition to that, the producing company permits the showing of any 16 millimeter pictures that are not shown on a 35 millimeter roll. That is common, but you cannot blame them for restricting the 16 millimeter pictures to the places where they do not conflict with the 35 millimeter.

MR. WISMER: That is fine. You mentioned certain places up there where they show some 16 millimeter pictures. Do they show them in Minden?

MR. FROST: No, that is a 35 millimeter town.

MR. WISMER: The type of programme could be available for children once a week, if the government would make some regulations to break this monopoly.

MR. FROST: Oh, nonsense.

MR. WISMER: Nonsense, he says. One show a week the same time would not hurt the revenue accruing to the 30-millimeter producer. That is not "nonsense." You would certainly have the parents of the children on your side —for the first time—and get up past that 40 per cent. support.

MR. FROST: I did pretty well in my county.

MR. WISMER: You have some 16-millimetre films up there. You just told us about them. Bring some down here and see what happens.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, is the implication from the hon. member's (Mr. Wismer) remarks that 16-millimeter are not widely distributed now? I was up in Hudson's Bay, and I saw three or four of them up there. Would it be sensible to take a 35-millimeter and go way up there?

MR. WISMER: If I did not have so many interruptions, I would get through a lot faster. I am asking, in all sincerity, on behalf of the people who have children, knowing full well it will cost industry something, but I am asking the government on behalf of parents to consider some simple regulations which will allow the type of better pictures that are available now on 16-millimeter to be shown to the children's audiences, and others, at least once a week, even in places where there is a theatre showing 35-millimeter pictures.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I have waited patiently for an opportunity to say something on this estimate, and I think the remarks I have to make can be taken in a practical sense to help solve the problem which the hon. member who spoke before me (Mr. Wismer) has raised in this House. I mean, I think the moving picture industry — and I am speaking of the 35 mm. type —has developed to the stage where it could make a great contribution to the battle society is now waging with juvenile delinquency by introducing into the legitimate theatres, shall we say, the right type of pictures to be shown on Saturday afternoons. But when I say that, Mr. Chairman, I realize full well the answer may be that it is hard to make a decision as to what is good for a child, and what is not.

MR. FROST: Does my hon. friend know this—

MR. ROBINSON: Please, Mr. Chairman, can any of us on this side complete our remarks without interruption?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBINSON: It is so difficult.

MR. FROST: Go ahead and take all the time you want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: You can have all the time you like, because we can sit here all night.

MR. LEAVENS: That is a threat.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is hardly a fair statement.

MR. FROST: You sit there and chatter and blather, and talk all you like.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is this an unimportant subject? A great many parents do not think so.

MR. ROBINSON: In all fairness, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I take up very much time in this House.

MR. FROST: I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) on that.

MR. ROBINSON: I do not speak unless I think I have something of practical value to say, so again I say that I feel the moving picture industry is large enough, and enjoying a measure of profits big enough, that even if it costs them something, it would be a contribution to society if they would develop a series of films to be shown specifically to child audiences on Saturday afternoons, so you could arrange what would appeal to the children, and at the same time get away from the objections we have to many types of films shown to children on Saturday afternoons.

I have two children, a little boy of 10 and a little girl of 5. I control, the best I can, the type of film they go to see. It is not easy. You can not tell by the name of a film, but if you knew that the theatre industry has gone to the trouble of developing certain types of film to be shown on Saturday afternoons, you could feel safe about letting your children go, and feel they would come back perhaps a little better for having seen that film.

I do not wish to take up more time, Mr. Chairman, but I feel this is important enough so that it can be considered, in co-operation with the government, and they would be taking a big step toward the education of our children, and toward the elimination of juvenile delinquency.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Chairman, since the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is in such a reasonable frame of mind tonight—

MR. FROST: I always like to be reasonable with you.

MR. MACLEOD: —I think I may be permitted to say a word or two on this vote, because I do feel this is a very important department of government. It deals with the foundation of our life, it influences the thinking of children perhaps more than either the church or the school, and if it is not properly controlled, it can certainly counteract a lot of good influences of church, school and home.

The first question in my mind is this; just how competent is the present board? I am not very familiar with its personnel. I do not know how long they have been there. I just wonder if the people who sit on that board are the best-qualified people to determine what type of film should be shown to the children of this province.

I was very glad to hear the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) say that from time to time it has been the practice to invite a panel of people to pass judgment on a certain type of film, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) intimated that usually these people are called in when sex is the main theme.

MR. FROST: No, any type of picture. I have called them in on many, many pictures.

MR. MACLEOD: I would commend that practice. But I would also suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that he might very well have a permanent panel to act in an advisory capacity to the present Board of Censors.

MR. FROST: I might say to my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod), Mr. Chairman, that I know he puts that suggestion forward in good faith. The

difficulty with a permanent panel is that you are unable, perhaps, to get the cross-section that applies to a certain thing. For instance, I remember during the war days we had a certain picture that related to a commentary, as it were, on the life in Germany, and there was considerable objection to it. I forget the name of the picture. We were criticized for releasing the picture. Our board was criticized for passing the picture, so we got a panel consisting of the heads of all the military organizations here, the Daughters of the Empire, some of the judges here in the City of Toronto. We were being criticized for releasing this picture because it was offending against the attitude of public mind which existed at that time. We got the board together, and they unanimously confirmed the finding of the Censor Board.

On the other hand, the Censor Board released two sex pictures. I took considerable exception to it, myself. It may be just an aversion, but they were released, and finally there was some complaint. At that time I appointed an entirely different type of Board. I took clergymen, Salvation Army, and a great number of people of that sort, and they reversed the decision of the Censor Board, and when they did, I carried out their judgment. So my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) will see the difficulty in having a set panel. It is wonderful the co-operation we get from the various churches. Brother McGrath, of the Catholic League of Decency; the Salvation Army and other people; I think Dr. Brayley of the United Church, and Dr. Bingham, of the Baptist people; they are great people, on certain phases of the thing, and in some ways are better than perhaps somebody else would be.

MR. MACLEOD: I will concede there may come along a particular film which would call for a different group of people. But I am speaking rather about the usual run of films, the sort of stuff that is shown in the movie houses in greater Toronto week after week. I think if a permanent panel were to be set up, consisting of such people as those whom I could mention—and I mention those because I know the people and while they may not be able to serve, they might be able to designate someone to serve for them. Such people as Dr. Willard Brewing, the Moderator of the United Church of Canada; Canon Judd, an outstanding leader of the Church of England—

MR. FROST: We have Canon Judd on one of the boards now.

MR. MACLEOD: Good. He was one of my teachers. Then I think among the educationists, we could do no better than select Dr. Althouse—

MR. FROST: I have had him, too.

MR. MACLEOD: Then I am thinking of Dr. Goldring.

MR. FROST: I have not had him, since I heard my friend (Mr. Millard)—

MR. MACLEOD: It shows you how backward you are in your thinking, if you have not heard of Dr. Goldring. He is one of the best-known educators in this city. Then you mentioned Father McGrath, an outstanding clergyman of the Roman Catholic faith. Then I would include one or two outstanding psychiatrists, because I am quite certain there are many films—

MR. FROST: We would be sunk without a trace, if get got those fellows on.

MR. MACLEOD: That is one point on which you people, particularly the hon. Minister of Institutions (Mr. Dunbar) have a very backward viewpoint. I think they have made a great contribution to society, and will make a greater contribution in the days to come.

MR. DUNBAR: We think so.

MR. MACLEOD: I would like to see a representative of the A.F. of L. Council of the City of Toronto, and the Toronto Trades and Labour Congress—

MR. FROST: On the last board I had here last week, Mrs. Isobel Ross represented Dr. Goldring. Oh, I have got them all on the panel.

MR. DUNBAR: You have forgotten Dr. McCullagh.

MR. MACLEOD: I do not think I want to recommend George (Mr. McCullagh) for that kind of a job, because I do not think he is competent.

MR. GEMMELL: How about Tim Buck?

MR. FROST: You are mistaken about that. I have a number of people here, so many you would be surprised, and you would be surprised at the interest they take.

MR. MACLEOD: Well, I am glad to see that George (Mr. McCullagh) is coming along.

MR. FROST: Let me ask you this; here is Dr. H. W. Lore, of the Chinese Community Centre, and Mr. F. S. Wong, of the Chinese Community Centre. You would not think I would go so far afield as that, would you?

MR. MACLEOD: I do not know why not.

MR. FROST: I have Mr. Ferris, Assistant General Director of the Health League of Canada, and Dr. Bate, of the Health League of Canada, and Dr. Van Wyck, one of the leading gynaecologists. Oh, I have a roster here which would surprise you.

MR. SALSBERG: You have more than you know.

MR. MACLEOD: I would suggest to my friend, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that he should seriously consider making this panel a fairly permanent body, and not just a body to be called in when some sexy picture comes to town.

MR. FROST: That is very difficult.

MR. MACLEOD: I do not think it is difficult. I think this permanent panel might well be asked, at the end of the year, to make a selection of the ten best pictures of the year, shown on the screens in the Province of Ontario, as a means of indicating to the movie barons in Hollywood that this province and this country of ours has a higher standard than is to be found across the line. The Hollywood people create and produce pictures that they think will appeal to the American taste but, after all, we are a country in our own right and what "goes over" in the United States may not necessarily "go over" here. I think, insofar as possible, the censorship board in the Province of Ontario should try to influence the motion picture industry in the United States so that in the production of these pictures they will take into account the taste of the Canadian people. That taste may be very different from that of the people in the United States. I think we should encourage the production of Canadian pictures. I do not see any reason why, in the very near future, Canada should not develop a motion picture of her own and I would like to see this great province of ours operating in that field. I would like to see us give greater encouragement to British pictures in this province because I think the British pictures are far superior.

MR. FROST: I may say, there are, as you know, through the Odeon circuit a great many British pictures coming in here and this has advanced very rapidly.

MR. MACLEOD: I would like to see more of them.

MR. FROST: The Arthur Rank Corporation and others—

MR. MACLEOD: I am glad to hear you say that and I know I can only express the hope that more British pictures will come to Ontario and Canada. As I said a moment ago, I think they have a far higher standard than is the case with Hollywood produced pictures. Now, I am not unmindful of the difficulty mentioned by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) insofar as this permanent panel is concerned. However, I think he should make a very special effort to call the types of individuals I

have mentioned to sit in very frequently and not just when some controversial picture comes along. From what the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) said tonight I think he desires to move in a progressive direction and I was very glad to hear him tell my colleague (Mr. Salsberg) that the picture Native Land, had not been rejected by the Censorship Board but on the contrary, the Censorship Board is prepared to screen that picture as quickly as possible and if it passes the Censorship Board it will be made available for showing in the Province of Ontario.

Finally, I would like to say I think the amount of money voted for the Censorship Board is very small, having regard to the important duty they have to perform. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) might well consider enlarging the present board. How many are on it now?

MR. FROST: Three are on it. I think the board can stand enlarging.

MR. MACLEOD: I think you should go through that roster of important people you have mentioned earlier and see if you cannot find two or three additional people, who may have special qualifications not possessed by the present members of the board. I hope, Mr. Chairman, when we come back next year we shall be able to compliment the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) on having acted on the constructive suggestions that have been put forward by this side of the House. Now, is that of any use?

MR. FROST: I am very glad to have the suggestions and I can assure you—

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Mr. Chairman, I want to report the position taken by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson). I think the whole thing comes down to what is the most important, our children or the profits of the movie industry. It is one thing or the other. I think the children are the most important, and I think the second-rate, sometimes the third and fourth-rate pictures are put on Saturday afternoons. The motion picture industry feels that they can get people on Saturday afternoon anyway, and do not have to put on a good picture. I think the movie industry, the screen, is probably the greatest educational factor, bar none. I think we should make every effort to put only the best things before children. They can be amusing, they can be funny —the story of the children of other lands is very amusing. Children are attracted by other children who do things differently from themselves. This should be of great concern to the government as well as to the mothers. I have heard many mothers say they won't allow their children to go to the movies on Saturday afternoon. They would allow them if they knew it was going to be a good movie. I know mothers who do not have their children go to movies any more because they are not sure of the type of picture they are going to see. The motion picture industry has made a mint of money, there is no reason why they could not spend a million on other pictures for other countries. I do not know what a million is, but whatever it means—

MR. FROST: It is a lot of money.

MISS MACPHAIL: —They could put before the children's eyes things that are amusing or imaginative, and things that are good for the children to see. Children are very imaginative, they are very attracted by children of other lands who live differently and dress differently and do different things. I know there are a very great number of mothers who are upset about what their children are subjected to on Saturday afternoons. I have gone sometimes, not because I like to go Saturday afternoons, but just to see what they are looking at. Some of it is really poor stuff. It is either hooting, rooting, tooting stuff or crime stuff. That is not the kind of thing they should see. I think the whole weight of the Censorship Board should be thrown in the way of showing better things on Saturday afternoons.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, the great difficulty is doing anything because tastes vary so much and people's opinions vary so much. My friend over here (Mr. MacLeod) mentioned a psychiatrist. You cannot get two psychiatrists in the provence who think the same. They are all different, and they all think differently. You take for example, many personal tastes. I have a weakness for liking wild west pictures. I like to see horses and shooting and all that business.

MR. MACLEOD: Just 16 years old.

MR. FROST: That is right: I cannot see anything wrong with that. I think it is all right. If I had children that were of age to go to the movies I think that would be all right but if there was drinking in the picture it would turn me the other way, if it were a drinking picture that the kiddies went to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: That is my reaction. On the other hand, there are people who take the opposite view and people with just as good judgment as I have. I was rather interested on Sunday, listening with my wife to Ozzie and Harriet. I do not know it you people listen to Ozzie and Harriet, but Ozzie was questioning his "kiddies" as to what show they went to. The "kiddies" said there was an old woman poisoned and somebody else poisoned and all kinds of gruesome things. Ozzie said, "I thought I told you not to go to pictures like that, what was the name of the picture?" And the "kiddies" said, "Hamlet."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: What can you do? There is the situation. Supposing they should make a picture of the book Treasure Island by Robert Louis Stevenson—I have read that book myself several times, and I would like to see a picture based on that idea. I think all young children should read Treasure Island, about Long John Silver and all the rest of it. I would like to see a picture based on that book. That would be good for the kiddies. On the other hand, lots of people disagree with that. I would say to the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) it all comes down to a question of parental control and discipline and I do not know how you can cover that. We mark certain pictures for "adult showing only." We do not forbid adults taking their children there, but we think it would be better not to. Now their judgment may be better than ours, and they take the kiddies. I think people have to discriminate and be careful, and it is pretty hard to take the place of a parent.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): Have you ever seen a wild west picture where there was not drinking?

MR. FROST: There is always shooting, always about fifteen people killed and things like that.

MR. SALSBERG: They drink from the rivers.

MR. L. F. K. FELL (CCF Parkdale): Perhaps, the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) has found one part of the answer when he pointed out that it was a matter of taste. I would suggest that possibly on some of his panel, or at least in the process of determining which pictures are good for children to see and which pictures are not good for children to see—might it not be a reasonable suggestion when, after our adult censors have seen the pictures and told us what they thought the children should see, why not show them to a group of children and see their reactions to these pictures?

MR. FROST: I will give my friend an interesting example. In a little town not far from Toronto, there are two theatres. In one theatre the proprietor decided that on Saturday afternoons he would put on children's pictures. The children would not go to the theatre, they went to the other one. It would not work.

MR. FELL: I suppose that is entirely true because, first of all, sensationalism is applied by the press in the type of advertising that is given to these films to attract children. Nevertheless, I think they should be shown to a group of children where it is easy to get a cross-section of children. Some of us in this group have conducted a small survey particularly having to do with comic books. We gave them comic books with Biblical stories and we also gave them a few comic books a little livelier than that, books we were not fond of them having. The Biblical comic books proved to be more attractive in the end because the stories in them could be related to them and it was something they were being trained in at Sunday School and at home. In the picture industry it has been said you cannot get the film exhibitors to do this sort of thing. Now, I think if we are going to allow—perhaps we should go over to the other benches on the other side—it seems to me Mr. Chairman, we are going to sit back and to accept the pictures shown at the film houses and what type of picture they are showing to our children, we might just as well throw the whole thing up and stop sending them. I think it is unreasonable to take that stand.

I think if we tried in some area, say in the City of Toronto, and talked with our film house owners about the educational work we are trying to do with our children, as to the value of showing our children these things, we could get them to co-operate because they are human beings and some of them mothers and fathers. Therefore, they have a very real understanding of the problem and I think if they were approached on a reasonable basis they would co-operate. I suggest that if we were to take some of our younger children in certain groups into consideration and get some of their ideas and find out what pictures are acceptable to them, we could make recommendations to the theatre owners in our district. We would have some workable plan to get us on the right track. The way we are going we are doing only a half-way job.

MR. J. D. BAXTER (L Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this further but I would suggest we are trying to put a job on the Censor Board that rightly belongs to the citizens of this province. I think we are asking them to do something which we have failed to do ourselves in the way of censoring pictures which we do not feel are the ones we want the boys and girls of this province to see. I am not playing one part of the province against another but I do say this: I think our craving for certain types of pictures over the past few years, particularly during the war, has caused the motion picture industry to enlarge that particular quantity and type of film. I think rather than place all these responsibilities on the Censorship Board or a film board, that is what is happening in this province, we are not trying a little bit. If we see a type of picture appearing in a theatre which we do not feel is in the best interests of the province, all we have to do is stay away from that theatre until a different type of picture begins to appear on the screen. I think we can talk all night about the duties of the Censorship Board, we can attack the government hour after hour but the whole thing is largely determined by the kind of view we have on a certain kind of film. I think there is lots of opportunity in this province, in the various film libraries to get good films at a cheaper rate than we have to pay in seeing them today. I respectfully suggest that the time has come for us not to expect the government to direct our tastes for the kind of film that will appear on the screen. We can clean out things a lot quicker than can any kind of censorship we might put into effect.

Vote No. 148 agreed to.

On vote No. 149.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has before him figures as to the cost of the collection of corporation taxes in the total of the $540,000?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): I would say to

my hon. friend (Mr. Brown) that it is not any more than $540,000 in any event.

MR. BROWN: Pardon?

MR. FROST: I say it is not any more than $540,000 in any event.

MR. BROWN: The $900 may not be, eh?

MR. FROST: No, I say it is not any more than the amount of the item $540,000.

MR. BROWN: I quite appreciate that, but I just wondered what amount it is. I understand the Controller of Revenue has obligations to perform in addition to collecting the taxes from corporations.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. BROWN: I just wondered how much that amounted to.

MR. FROST: I just could not give you the break-down.

MR. BROWN: I was wondering if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would make a mental note, where he discusses revenues in cases such as this, if, in another year's Estimates, we could have the break-down in regard to these, as between business, income and so on?

MR. FROST: Oh, yes, I will be glad to give you it.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

Vote 149 agreed to.

On vote 150.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question. Under the Savings Office section of this vote is there any interchangeability of personnel of the Savings Office and the rest of the civil service?

MR. FROST: Not particularly, no.

MR. WISMER: The reason I ask the question is that this Savings Office business does not seem to be expanding any, and there is no particular incentive or promotional possibility for the staff of the Savings Office.

MR. FROST: That is quite obvious, that such should be the case. This is not a banking business. These Savings Offices—my recollection is there are 18 of them in the Province of Ontario—handle deposits which I think are up to about $66,000,000 at the present time, from something less than $40,000,000, five or six years ago.

These Savings Offices are individual offices. The head office requirements such as in a bank, are not there, therefore you might move them from one place to another, but most of them buy their own homes in one locality and like to stay there.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask too. The $304,000 is statutory, but I am wondering if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) can give us any idea as to whether these Savings Offices carry this, or whether there is a deficit?

MR. FROST: It all depends of course on the way you look at the money. It you treat it as call money, then of course the rate it would average is somewhere around 1.96—a little less than 2 per cent. the money is costing us—nevertheless for demand money, that is a very high rate for money which is, you might say "hot" money, that is, money which is payable on demand.

On the other hand, it is just like a reservoir, it maintains a certain level; withdrawals are made and deposits are made, and the levels are remarkably constant, so I would say, taking one factor against another, that the Savings Offices are adjusting items.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): May I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) if we get any revenue from the Post Office downstairs? I see no item on revenue.

MR. FROST: No, actually we do not. It is a service that is maintained within these extensive buildings here,

and you take the item on postage there, that is government postage; as you know, many hon. members here during the sessions have their letters franked. I would not say that took up all the dollars $273,000—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: —but it adds up to that.

MR. DENNISON: But does not the Dominion Government give a certain revenue to the province for maintaining the Post Office here?

MR. FROST: No, not here. We have considered sometimes actually making this into a post office, but there are disadvantages to that which probably outweigh any advantages.

Votes Nos. 150 and 151 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): The Department of Public Works. I might say we would like to clean up the Department of Public Works, and then take up certain of the Opposition bills. We are very far behind schedule at the moment, but the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) has some of his officials here, and we would like to clean up the Department of Public Works if we can.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), was not there an assurance given to the hon. members of the House by the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) that hon. members of the Opposition would be notified in advance when their bills were going to be called?

MR. FROST: I have taken it up with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). He knows of certain bills we are going to call.

MR. SALSBERG: I see.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, in the Public Works the Estimates are all before you. Before we enter onto that, in view of the fact the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) who is now out of the House levied some very severe criticism against this department some time toward the latter end of November, I think I will make a fairly extensive report on the department.

It is one of the Departments which has very diversified jobs to do in connection with the affairs of this province, and its works extend from border to border. Before going into the actions of the department, I would like to submit a report to this House, in an effort to expand and clarify many of the views which you have, and which the different votes enumerate in our Estimates. I will also give you an idea of the progress which we have made on our many projects during the fiscal year ending, so that the whole will present a complete picture.

First of all, I would like to state that in keeping with the expanding needs of this province, the government has directed the carrying out of a large accelerated programme of construction to meet the requirements of the various departments, and, despite the limiting factors in connection with the material and labour supply, take pride in the progress made during the closing fiscal year 1948-49.

The Department of Public Works has successfully completed, or has under way, or started, many projects during the period, and in so doing has contributed considerably to the present and future expansion of government services to the people of this province. The work generally has been limited wherever possible to the type of construction which would interfere least with the supply of labour and materials for housing projects.

As a matter of economic policy, the existing facilities of the province have been expanded wherever possible in preference to undertaking entirely new projects. This policy, however, has not been adhered to where it has been clearly indicated that the needs of the public could best be served by new construction projects.

Our construction programme during the past fiscal year has been restricted

to projects of a nature which could not be postponed and still maintain the various essential public services, and, for this reason, many projects were, of necessity, held in abeyance pending a return of more normal conditions in the construction industry.

In a general way, the work recently completed and that which is now under way together with the projected work for the coming fiscal year, is set out in the following divisions of this report.

The work items enumerated have been carried out by the Ontario Department of Public Works with the co-operation of the various departments concerned, and I am very pleased to have this opportunity of submitting this information to you and trust that it will give you a better idea of the scope and the variety of the work carried out by this department.

WORK FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ontario Agricultural College and Ontario Veterinary College

A large programme of expansion has been carried out at the Ontario Agricultural College and the Ontario Veterinary College, Guelph, and the most recently completed projects and work items to be carried on, or started, during the next fiscal year at these centres may be enumerated, generally as follows:

At the Ontario Agricultural College

Additions to agriculture engineering building. Almost completed.

New steam generating unit. Completed.

Poultry department. 3 hen houses. Completed.

Poultry department. Experimental laying houses. Completed.

Poultry department. Service building. Well under way.

Poultry department. Two-storey brooder house. Now under way.

Renovation of mechanical refrigeration system in the horticultural building. Completed.

New Standby well for water supply with pumping equipment. Completed.

Emergency water pumping unit on city supply line. Completed.

The additional work items projected for the coming fiscal year include small animal building, addition to agriculture building, lecture room for abattoir, dairy building alterations and improvements, seed cleaning plant, milk room at dairy barn, new pump house and special heating for greenhouse.

At Ontario Veterinary College

Large 3-storey fireproof addition to main veterinary college building. Complete except for some equipment.

Residence for principal. Completed.

Exterior painting of main building, nutrition annex and out buildings. Completed.

Front entrance drive paving at main building. Completed.

Autopsy building. Well under way.

Fox and mink labs. installed in former army huts. Completed.

Service building for present student's trailer camp and for future use as a playing field house for both Ontario Agricultural College and Ontario Veterinary College students. Completed.

The additional new work items projected for next year for main college group include garage and isolation lab., sheep shed, small research building, and hay and straw storage shed.

And for new experimental disease farm, poultry colony houses, poultry ranch house, sheep shed, and alterations to existing buildings.

Experimental Farm and Agricultural School, Ridgetown

Plans have been completed for the erection of a residence for students at this school and it is expected that construction work on the building will be started shortly.

Agricultural School, Kemptville

Further general development of this school is contemplated during the coming year and the following work items have been projected: Farm mechanics building, staff and farm labourers' houses, piggery, storage building for vegetables and fruits, greenhouse additions, silo, and the connection of the water and sewage systems with the town system.

Experimental Station, Vinelands

The new horticultural products laboratory, the dormitory building for unmarried members of the staff and a pair of semi-detached residences for married staff are now nearing completion and will be completed at this station during the coming fiscal year.

Improvements to the water supply system will be continued.

The extension to the chemical lab. in the main building and the implement shed and fire equipment house have been completed.

WORK FOR DEPARTMENT OF ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Provincial Police Lock-Ups and Living Quarters

Considerable progress has been made in the work of establishing provincial police lock-ups together with constable's quarters in Northern Ontario, and the locations and progress of these may be stated as follows:

Armstrong—Contract awarded and site arranged.

Atikokan—Contract awarded for start in early spring.

Beardmore—Former school building purchased and altered. Work completed.

Bracebridge — Old district gaol converted to lock-up and constable's residence, with new two-car garage. Completed.

Burk's Falls—Police residence and radio room. Completed.

Geraldton—Existing building altered and extended. Work almost completed.

Gogama — Building purchased and altered and fire-proof cell block added. Work well under way.

Hornepayne—Almost completed.

Nakina—Contract awarded for start in spring.

Nipigon—Almost completed.

Pickle Lake—Work well under way.

Red Lake—Building purchased, plans made for alterations and new fire-proof cell block to be added. Acquired building will accommodate provincial police offices and living quarters and hearing room, as well as mining recorder's offices. Work to be started this month.

Temagami—Provincial police quarters and cell block. Almost completed with exception of the installation of cells.

Living accommodation for unmarried constables and garage accommodation will be added as required this coming fiscal year at various locations in the north. In addition to the foregoing, the following requirements have been projected for next year for the Ontario Provincial Police: District headquarters buildings for Sudbury, South Porcupine, London, Fonthill, and general headquarters for Toronto, as well as new lock-up and residence accommodation at Warren, Chapleau and White River.

PROVINCIAL POLICE RADIO TRANSMITTER STATIONS

Property was purchased and provincial police radio transmitter stations have been completed at Ancaster, Aurora, Barrie, Belleville, Chatham, Cornwall, Essex, Fonthill, London, Mount Forest, Perth and Peterborough.

District Court Houses

Progress has been made in connection with the improvement and remodelling of court houses as follows:

At Bracebridge—The work of providing exit stair towers and public lavatories together with general renovation. Well under way.

At Fort Frances—This building is now being rewired and a general pro-

gramme is now laid out for general remodelling. Will be carried on.

At Kenora—The general renovation of this building has, for the most part been completed.

At North Bay—The remodelling of the top floor to provide Lands and Forest Department offices is completed, except for painting and finishing.

At Parry Sound—Extensive renovations for the most part have been completed except for painting.

At Port Arthur—Extensive roof repairs have been made.

At Sudbury — Extensive exterior renovation programme completed, including roofing and sheet metal, fire escape, sand blasting and painting.

In addition to the foregoing, additional work items have been projected for next year for addition to Bracebridge registry office and new registry office for Port Arthur.

WORK FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Belleville (Ontario School for Deaf)

Programme of renovation of main building, roofs, sheet metal work and windows and the ventilation and reflooring of drill hall has been carried out.

The projected work items for next fiscal year include provision of a workshop by remodelling an existing building and the installation of fire escapes and improvements to plumbing system.

Brantford (Ontario School for Blind)

A complete fire alarm system was installed throughout main building, girls' and boys' dormitories and workshops, with connection to the town of Brantford's fire department.

A programme of fire-proofing was started at this school during the past year, and the work will be continued during the coming fiscal year.

The starting of the construction of an assembly hall and a junior residence building with hospital wing is also projected for the coming year.

A programme has recently been completed of repainting all exterior wood and metal work of these buildings.

Haileybury (Provincial Institute of Mining)

A new boiler house is projected for this institute.

Hamilton (Provincial Institute of Textiles)

Alterations were carried out in the former teachers' technical college to adapt the building for use as a training school for senior personnel in the textile industry.

Normal Schools

The work of improving classroom lighting systems in normal schools, will be continued throughout the coming year, together with general improvements to the structures.

At the Ottawa Normal School

A renovation of the electrical system was made and new fluorescent lighting installed.

Work for the Department of Health at Ontario Hospital School, Montague. Considerable progress has been made during the presently ending fiscal year on the construction of the new Ontario Hospital School to serve eastern Ontario.

The first group of buildings for ambulatory patients is now nearing completion and provides accommodation for 890 beds. This group comprises 6 ward wings for patients together with bathing pavilions and outdoor clothing and visitors' units as well as general dining rooms for each sex.

Attached and forming part of this group is a service wing having a central staff dining room, central kitchen, cold storage, general storage section, bakery and milk pasteurizing units, all of which are well under way.

The drainage system around the buildings is well under way, and the construction of the main outfall sewer line to the river will be put in hand shortly.

A start will be made during the next fiscal year on the erection of a central heating plant and laundry building, and the foundation for a new surgical and clinical wing.

Fire-proofing and fire prevention work at Ontario hospitals. An extensive programme of fire-proofing and fire prevention work in the patients buildings of many of the existing Ontario hospitals is already under way and definite progress has been made in improving the safety of these hospitals.

At Ontario Hospital, Orillia, fire stop walls and fire doors have been installed.

At Ontario Hospital, Brockville, fire stop walls, fire doors, fire exit stair towers together with fire resisting floors are being installed in the first section of this programme.

At Ontario Hospital, Kingston, the first stage of the fire-proofing programme in the main building has been completed. This work has included a new central fire tower stair well with new elevator and fire doors providing exits from the patients' adjoining side wings on all floors. The second stage of the programme is now under way to fire-proof the patients' dining rooms located on all floors of the main building adjoining the new central fire tower escape stair.

At Ontario Hospital, New Toronto, cottage 5 has been renovated and new fire resisting floors installed.

At Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, the work of installing fire exit stair towers is well under way, and the fire-proofing of one section of floors in single rooms has been started.

Water storage reservoirs have been installed at Ontario Hospital, Fort William, and Ontario Hospital, Penetang.

This type of fire-proofing and fire prevention work will be continued at these hospitals and expanded to include similar work at other hospitals.

General work at Ontario Hospitals.

At Ontario Hospital, Orillia, a sewer line has been laid to connect the hospital to the town of Orillia's new sewage disposal plant, and an addition to the laundry is at present under way. New laundry equipment has already been delivered.

At Ontario Hospital, St. Thomas, two new root houses have been constructed and landscaping work carried out.

Additional work items projected for the coming fiscal year.

Central kitchen and dining hall centres are projected to connect the Ontario Hospital, Orillia, with the town of Orillia's system to provide an auxiliary source of supply.

Negotiations are now being carried out to acquire premises for an outpatient's clinic.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Before the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) goes on, would you revert back to the item of the New Toronto Hospital's projected extension?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, I said central kitchen and dining hall centres are projected for Ontario Hospitals at New Toronto and Brockville and Ontario Hospital School at Orillia.

MR. MILLARD: That is the reason I asked the question because that subject is a very important one, for members have been requesting the expanding of that property rather than using it for other purposes and moving the building.

MR. DOUCETT: I will deal with that later; I will be glad to answer that question.

Negotiations are now being carried out to acquire premises for an outpatient's clinic for the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital.

Two new cottages are projected for the T.B. division at Ontario Hospital, Woodstock, one for male and one for female patients, each with a capacity of 80 beds, 160 beds in all.

The De La Salle College buildings and premises at Aurora have just been purchased and will be altered and fitted for use as an annex for the Ontario

Hospital, Orillia. It is expected that these premises will accommodate 250 beds after alteration.

New Mental hospitals for Head of Lakes.

The need for additional mental hospital bed capacity at the Head of the Lakes has been realized for some time, but a start in this work has been deferred owing to labour and material shortages. It is projected for the coming year that a start may be made provided that satisfactory tenders can be obtained.

Work for the Department of Lands and Forests.

General work already completed or well under way: A large programme of the smaller and miscellaneous work items of new construction and improvements, too numerous to mention at this time, at the various Lands and Forests Department headquarters and divisional points, has been carried on during the fiscal year now ending, and will be continued during this coming fiscal year.

A large portion of this work has been carried out with the active co-operation of the field forces of the Department of Lands and Forests.

Some idea may be gathered regarding the scope and variety of the work for this department by the following list of the more important work items which are now under way and require to be completed during the next fiscal year as follows:

For air service division; the Sault Ste. Marie hangar is completed and now in use, but certain further improvements are under way at the present time with regard to fire protection:

Various residences for pilots and mechanics require to be completed, such as for the air bases at Orient Bay, Sudbury, Gogama and Oba Lake.

For research division: The fish laboratory, greenhouse and water distribution system at Maple are nearing completion;

For fish and wildlife division: The programme of fish and hatchery renovation already under way requires to be continued at Dorion, Pembroke, White Lake, Chatsworth and Deer Lake, and a renovation programme started at Hills Lake;

For forest protection division: Tenders have been called for the supply of 50 lookout towers for distribution and erection at locations to be determined. A new radio building with residence for operators has just been completed at Maple, and the radio antennae towers are now being erected. Contracts were awarded for (a) a new chief ranger's residence at Franz and (b) new headquarters buildings for Stonecliff;

Reforestation division: Piping has been ordered for extensive irrigation schemes at Orono, Kemptville and Fort William forest nurseries, and the work will be carried out during the next fiscal year.

The following list of work items are those which are projected for the coming fiscal year, and give further illustration of the wide diversity of the requirements of the Lands and Forests Department:

8 district office buildings;

26 smaller type office buildings, some of which are combined with warehouses;

54 workshops, warehouses, implement sheds or garages;

86 residences and cabins for staff;

32 boat houses, docks, breakwaters, dams, et cetera;

25 telephone line installations or improvements or replacements of existing telephone lines;

36 extensive additions to this department's bush roads and trails, including sidewalks, bridges, et cetera;

36 additions or extensions to services of a miscellaneous character such as small additions to buildings and improvements at Rondeau Park and Algonquin Park.

Work for the Department of Reform Institutions new industrial farms: As previously announced, new industrial

farms have been set up at Burritt's Rapids and Burtch, and a temporary farm has been in use at Neys for some time. At Burritt's Rapids and Burtch, a construction programme is now under way and will be continued during the coming fiscal year. This development is part of this government's scheme to replace the common jails by establishing industrial farms at various centres through the province.

Industrial Farm, Burwash: During the past year a large housing development has been under way at this institution, and at the present time, some 20 new housing units have been completed for the use of married members of the staff. Construction work will be continued during the coming year until a total of 60 apartments for staff are completed.

Other new work projected for the institution includes a new central kitchen and dining hall, a central heating plant, a new water works system for camp No. 1, erection of drill hall recently removed from Army Camp at Cornwall, industrial workshops, isolation cell block and a fire hall.

Construction of a large addition to the public school building is now well advanced.

Industrial Farm, Monteith. Plans are now being prepared for the construction of a proposed cell block to be built at this institution for use as a district jail to serve this area.

Ontario Reformatory, Brampton. The former Army Camp buildings at this location have been under course of reconstruction as the buildings were, generally, on wood post foundations and as deterioration had set in, it was considered advisable to put in concrete foundation walls. This work will be proceeded with as required.

A new motor mechanics building is projected for this institution.

Ontario Reformatory, Guelph. A start was made last year on the construction of a 50-bed hospital, but work was delayed owing to material shortages. These shortages have now been somewhat eased, and the work will be continued as soon as weather conditions permit.

New work projected for a start during the new fiscal year includes servery and dining room for guards, root house addition, new horse barn roof, abattoir refuse disposal plan, and renovation of water supply system.

Ontario Reformatory, Mimico. The work of rebuilding the brick and tile making plant at this institution has been in progress for some two years now, and it is expected that the renovation will be completed this year. Progress has been limited by the fact that production of brick and tile products for other projects has required to be maintained during the course of the work, and the materials and equipment required have been in very short supply.

A former patient's building at this institution has recently been converted to provide four apartments for married members of the staff.

The new work projected for this institution includes a permanent cell block, and an addition to the dormitory building to provide extension of offices, kitchen, dining rooms, stores, et cetera.

Training Schools, Galt, Bowmanville and Cobourg. A new residence for the superintendent of the Boys' Training School, Galt, is now near completion and a root house has recently been completed at the same institution. Further improvements are contemplated for the boys' training school, Bowmanville, and the premises of the girls' training school, Cobourg, will be enlarged by the purchase of the large residence in the vicinity of the present buildings.

District gaols. At Saulte Ste. Marie Gaol, an addition is projected to provide additional cells for females.

At Fort Frances Gaol, an extensive programme of renovation is projected.

At Parry Sound Gaol, renovation work will be continued.

Work for Travel and Publicity Department. Work for the following publicity centres has been finished or started during the presently ending fiscal year. A new building was erected

at Pigeon River, and one started at Cornwall. Space was acquired and fitted for a new centre in the Princess Elizabeth Building, Niagara Falls. At Fort Frances an existing building was purchased and extended and fitted for another information bureau. Further new tourist reception centres are projected for Sault Ste. Marie, Cornwall and Lansdowne, One-Thousand Islands Bridge. Renovations or improvements will be carried out as required at the various existing reception centres.

Department of Public Works. In addition to the various building and engineering works shown under the different headings throughout this report, as being the responsibility of the Department of Public Works, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that this department has the responsibility of not only the planning, designing and construction of these buildings, and other projects, but has also the added responsibility of the operational management of the Parliament Buildings and east block and many other departmental office buildings in connection with the supply of heat, light and power and telephone and telegraph services, together with general housekeeping services, elevator services, gardening, landscaping and all forms of maintenance and repair in connection therewith.

Parliament and departmental buildings—fire-proofing programme.

The work of remodelling the east wing of the Parliament Buildings, started during the last fiscal year, will be continued during the coming year, and it is expected that the progress can be accelerated as it is of considerable importance that the non-fire-proof sections of this building be made fire-resisting as soon as possible. This work of course must be done in progressive stages owing to the work requiring to be done while the building is in full use.

Motion Picture Branch. The motion picture censorship and theatre inspection branch of the Treasury Department has now been moved from the 4th floor of the Parliament Buildings and re-located in a suitable one-storey province-owned building at Leaside following the remodelling of the latter to suit the particular requirements. The changing of this branch to other remote quarters has removed a potential fire hazard from this building.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Is not the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) going to take note of the fact we moved in?

MR. DOUCETT: We will deal with that later.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): A bigger hazard than ever.

MR. DOUCETT: Ontario Savings Office, Parliament Buildings. It has probably been noticed by many of the hon. members of this House that the banking quarters of the Ontario Savings Office have recently been enlarged and generally improved to the satisfaction of its many patrons.

Roof repairs and replacement. A programme of new work, including repairs and improvements, has been carried on in connection with the roofs of various sections of the Parliament Buildings. This programme will be continued during the next fiscal year.

454 University Avenue. The main entrance feature to the Liquor Control Board building at 454 University Avenue is now being remodelled to remove the old projecting entrance step feature. This work is being done to coincide with the street widening programme on University Avenue.

Immigration hostel at 291 Sherbourne Street. Existing buildings were remodelled to provide hostel accommodation for immigrants brought to Ontario.

Huron and College Streets. The former old Grace Hospital buildings were remodelled to provide additional office accommodation for the Education Department and the Fire Marshal.

Workmen's Compensation Board building. The start of a new office building for the Workmen's Compensation Board is projected in the coming fiscal year.

General work for all departments. The work of the Public Works Department,

of course, covers such a wide range of items that the time at hand does not permit an all-inclusive detailed review, and in this connection, I would like to explain that in addition to the foregoing outline of work already carried out, now being carried out or proposed for implementation during this coming fiscal year, there is a formidable number of work items of a very varied character, which are usually undertaken by the Public Works Department as a matter of routine operations, but as the enumeration of these items in detail would unduly extend this report, I will confine the coverage of such to the following general divisions of the work for your information on this subject:

(a) Construction of buildings of minor importance or other general engineering projects;

(b) General additions, alterations and improvements to existing province-owned buildings;

(c) New equipment, machinery and furnishings;

(d) Replacement and repair of existing machinery and equipment;

(e) Extensions, renovations and replacements of mechanical service systems, including boiler plants, heating and ventilating systems, sewage, drainage, electrical power and lighting systems;

(f) General work in connection with landscaping, roads, walks and fences;

(g) General repairs of all descriptions.

Drainage works and other engineering projects. In addition to the various sections of the work which I have just outlined to you, dealing chiefly with public buildings and their services, I would like to add some explanations in connection with drainage works and other engineering projects which have to be dealt with by the Department of Public Works, as follows:

Re Provincial Aid to Drainage Act: During the past year 11 drainage schemes have been approved under the Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, and 20 per cent. of the cost of each project will be paid to the initiating municipality when the work is completed. Additional schemes will receive financial assistance if the proposed work conforms to the requirements of the Act.

Municipal drainage, not statutory. Funds are voted each fiscal year to provide assistance for small drainage works in the unorganized districts. These works are of a limited nature and in most cases the individual projects do not cost much over a few hundred dollars. The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act does not apply to works of this nature as the cost of a drainage scheme under that Act must exceed $10,000 if it is to get the 20 per cent. of the cost provided for. New Act to reduce this to $5,000.

The small sums usually allotted by the hon. Minister for this municipal drainage work gives assistance in needful cases without burdening the lands involved with additional taxation, and such assistance will be continued during the next fiscal year.

Maintenance of locks and dams. Considerable repair work has been necessary to the locks at Port Carling, the lock gates are being rebuilt and the dock planking has been replaced. The locks at Huntsville are also gradually being rebuilt as conditions permit.

Storage dams and docks. This department's programme of dam building has been increased in scope during the fiscal year now ending in an effort to provide water storage and obtain better control of flooding conditions previously experienced as well as to retain waters where and when advisable for the later dry periods.

The need for the rebuilding of the old dams and the establishment of new dams at many points has been given considerable study during last season, particularly in the Muskoka district, and a start has already been made to carry out a progressive programme along the course of the East River to correct the general water situation in this area.

Many other affected areas will receive careful study so that remedial works can be put in hand to correct as far as

possible the difficulties which have been reported and to this end additional construction gangs are now being organized. Officers of this department, the Lands and Forests Department, and the Hydro Electric Power Commission have been in co-operation on the matter of studying and outlining the work requirements in connection with these matters, and as the methods of proper engineering procedure and the works required are determined at the various points, the works programme will be considerably accelerated by further additions to the working forces of this department.

Nolins and Junction Creek Drainage work. The City of Sudbury has been granted financial assistance by the province during the past 5 years towards the cost of the Nolins and Junction Creek drainage scheme, which drains a large area outside of the city. The estimated cost of the work as planned is $369,150, and the value of the work completed to date is $327,577.61. No new work is contemplated for next year, but some minor expenses may be incurred.

Grants conservation. Some of my hon. friends on the other side of the House will recall that the former government gave financial assistance to the Grand River Conservation Commission towards the cost of the construction of the Shand Dam. The commission are now planning to proceed with the second scheme which involves the construction of a large dam on the Conestoga River near Glen Allen. The province will continue to contribute 37½ per cent. of the cost of this work, and it is anticipated that the dominion will also contribute a like amount.

Re conservation authorities. Since the Conservation Authorities Act was placed on the statutes in 1946, 11 authorities have been established, and the Department of Planning and Development have rendered excellent service in furnishing data and giving guidance to the authorities in the preparation of the several schemes now under way or in the blue-print stage. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, grants will be paid from funds voted by the Legislature towards the cost of such schemes as may be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Aid—flooding, Lake Nipissing. The serious flooding conditions prevalent during the spring run off in the watershed of Lake Nipissing have been under study by the Dominion Department of Public works, and the province has agreed to contribute on a 50-50 basis with the dominion towards the cost of the construction of the remedial works.

The dominion has recently proposed the construction of a controlled cut on the French River as a first step in relieving flood conditions on Lake Nipissing. This work is estimated to cost $300,000, and the province has suggested that the plans be prepared, contracts awarded, and the work supervised by the dominion.

Aid—dredging, Muskoka. To assist navigation in the Muskoka area, dredging operations have been undertaken by the dominion with the province paying 50 per cent. of the cost. Channels have been cleaned out in the Muskoka River, and at Port Carling, and further dredging operations will be carried out in the Lake of Bays during the coming summer.

Aid—remedial works. There are many municipalities that have special problems, resulting from the uncontrolled forces of nature that cause serious losses from year to year from flooding, erosion of farm lands, and other damages.

The cost of the necessary remedial works are generally far in excess of what can be levied in taxes on the area involved. We propose to study each problem and to render aid to the municipality to enable the work to be undertaken without placing too heavy a tax burden on the property owners. This assistance will be given to projects that do not qualify for aid under existing legislation, such as the Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, or where the grant under this Act would be insufficient to enable the municipality to proceed with the remedial works.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel that I have about used up all the time that is presently available for the purpose, and hope

that the details given in my report will have proved to be of interest and by so doing enable the hon. members of this House to more fully understand the various items included in our Estimates which are to follow.

I understand you are very happy that I am finished. Last year when I stood up the opposition wanted to know why I could not say something about what we have done. I have endeavoured to give you a very minor outline of the work which the Department of Public Works had to carry on during the operations of the year.

I do want to say, before I sit down, that in the Department of Public Works we are much under-manned at the present time. I owe a word of commendation to the very loyal officials and employees of that department for the splendid co-operation they have given this government and the people of Ontario during the past year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, on point of order. May I suggest that the page boys seem to be too young to be up this late, and we may be here a lot longer, and I would like to suggest they be excused for the balance of the night, if that is possible.

MR. DUNBAR: Might as well, if we are going to be here all night.

MR. FROST: I do not think that will be the case. There are certain bills here I have discussed with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe)—at least, certain bills I suggest that we should consider. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) will deal with some of these, and I do not think it will be necessary to stay here very long tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report certain resolutions.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, was the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) under the impression that the vote had passed?

MR. FROST: They sent for me outside and said the vote had passed.

MR. MACLEOD: It has not even begun.

MISS MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) that I listened to his impressive recital with bated breath to hear the amount of money set aside for providing facilities for the hon. members of the Legislature. I thought I was going to hear about filing cabinets and rooms for dictation, and quiet and peace.

MR. DOUCETT: That is for over in the hayloft?

MISS MACPHAIL: I would like to get rid of these funeral chairs in the dining room also.

MR. DOUCETT: When other chairs are available we will get rid of them.

MISS MACPHAIL: I understand the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) is spending a lot of money, I wish he would tell us what the chances are of getting some sort of equipment to work with in the year that lies ahead.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) a general question in connection with the Estimates of the Department of Public Works. The hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) and I had the opportunity of visiting the reformatory at Mimico, and we looked at some of the projects there, particularly the brick-making works. I would like to know how the product from those various institutions is integrated with the building requirements. Are they all used in the building programme of the department, or are they sold? How are they integrated with the Department of Public Works?

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I might say to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) that we are using all the brick made, and much more.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think that answers the question.

MR. MILLARD: But how is it used? Is it used and charged against the Department of Public Works, and the amount allowed to the reform institutions as income?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes. They charge us for it and we pay them.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, first of all, as a matter of public interest to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett), I think it should be stated that the Maple Leafs won three to two.

There are two things I want to mention on the Estimates, one of them I raised on a previous occasion, and that is, those mourners' benches up in the gallery on both sides. They are there to accommodate the public; they are extremely uncomfortable seats; they have been there for many years; and I do feel that in this day and age it ought to be possible for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) to install more comfortable seats in the galleries for the benefit of the public. I think it is the desire of every hon. member of this Assembly that the public should sit in on these debates in ever larger numbers, but I do suggest they do not have very much incentive for coming here, if they have to sit on those terrible contraptions in the galleries.

In the constituency of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) or nearby, there are factories which turn out regular theatre seats, and I suggest to him he might look into the question of placing an order with some of his friends down there and putting in better seating accommodation for the benefit of the taxpayers and the public of this province. I raised this with him a couple of years ago, and I was hopeful when he was giving his recitation tonight that he would mention something about that.

Another thing is the accoustics in the committee rooms downstairs on the main floor. They really are terrible. It is next to impossible for the members of a committee to hear what is said down there, and certainly extremely difficult for that section of the public who sit in on these deliberations. I think it is a very simple matter, and an inexpensive one, for the Minister to do something about it, and I am sure that all hon. members of the House who attend these committees would appreciate the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) doing just that.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could give us some information as to the ownership of the hospital at 999 Queen Street. I understand that building was sold by the Province of Ontario, presumably by the Department of Public Works, over 20 years ago. The commission, headed by Mr. P. D. Ross, stated in its report that the institute had been sold 20 years ago, and it was about to be vacated. Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) tell us when the province bought back that property, or if the province ever did buy it back, and if so, why, after the place was condemned and disposed of by the province. How on earth did it ever get back into our possession again? Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) care to give us a word of explanation, if he has it in hand, or is he waiting for the information?

MR. DOUCETT: I did not want to get up to interrupt you. I did not want to be rude.

MR. MacLEOD: That would be very much out of character for the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) because he is certainly not a rude Minister. He is a very gentlemanly gentleman, and we would like to see him over there (indicating) on the third seat.

MR. DUNBAR: You cannot forget that, can you?

MR. DOUCETT: As far as the accoustics of the committee room are concerned, we are working on that, and I hope by another year we will be able to improve the conditions, if the survey works out all right.

As far as the seating in the galleries. I must be honest, as I am an honest man, and say that I have given very little thought to it, although I do remember the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) bring-

ing it up before. However, that is one of the things which probably is secondary to many of the greater problems we have at hand.

As far as the hospital at 999 is concerned; twenty years ago, of course, I was down on a little municipal council, and we did not think of people who would ever need one of those buildings at the time, and I must say that I never have heard anything about the building being sold, although I did hear at one time it was going to be sold. I do not think it was sold. It has been in the possession of the Department of Health, and we have been doing work on it in the course of our duties in the department. That is all I know about the sale and purchase.

MR. MACLEOD: Are you saying it never was sold?

MR. DOUCETT: Not to my knowledge.

MR. MACLEOD: Does it not seem strange that a Royal Commission, appointed by the government of that day, would say in its report that the building was sold and was about to be vacated? I quoted from that in an earlier debate, from the report of Mr. P. D. Ross, the chairman of the commission, who stated the property had been sold and would no longer be used as a hospital. It seems strange they would make a statement of that sort.

MR. DOUCETT: They were going to sell it to the Grand Trunk, but the sale did not go through.

MR. MACLEOD: Too bad.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I heard the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) reply to the question raised by the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail), and I am sure he would wish to amplify it. I have always found the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) a very reasonable man to deal with, and I think he is perhaps under-estimating the importance of the matter. The hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) was referring back to the earlier suggestion that more facilities should be provided for the work which must be done by the hon. members of this House, if they are to discharge their functions effectively. I gathered from the reply by the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that he could not say anything as yet.

I would point this out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), and this is not said by way of criticism; it is a matter of fact, to which I think, attention should be drawn. In the year ended March 31, 1947, for example, the Department of Public Works expenditure for the main office alone, that is, the first vote, was $154,254.68. Now this year the hon. Minister is estimating for the main office, to be voted, $414,200. It is a matter of simple arithmetic to ascertain that this year the hon. Minister's (Mr. Doucett) estimate is more than double what the actual expenditures were a little more than two years ago—almost three times as much. I am not saying that is not necessary. I realize that the work of this department is expanding, particularly now that we are getting away from the immediate post-war period. But I do say that is a very large figure for a main-office estimate, and if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) can find it possible and desirable in a little more than two years to increase by almost three times the expenditures for the main office, I presume, for administrative purposes, that he cannot tell us it is not possible to find a few dollars for the purpose of providing the hon. members of this Legislature with adequate facilities.

I would point out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that for a long, long time the elected representatives of the people have had to carry on something in the nature of an unceasing vigil to protect the rights of parliament, and there has always been a tendency for the executive to encroach upon the rights of parliament. I suggested to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) in all seriousness that when he is undertaking such large expenditures for other purposes, including purely administrative work in his own department, he ought not to overlook the important function of the elected representatives of the people of Ontario,

particularly at a time when he comes to the House asking for approval of his Estimates. I think he should show more consideration for the hon. members of the House than he has shown tonight.

Speaking for myself, I find nothing in particular to criticize in the Estimates of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), but I do say this, that the question asked by the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) called for a much more complete reply than she received from the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett). The matter should be taken much more seriously than it has been. This Legislature, in the past, may have come very close to being a rubber stamp, and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) will agree it ought not to be a rubber stamp. If this is a democratic, law-making institution, it ought to be that in reality, and not merely in name, and Ministers of the Crown should lend their support in making this an effective legislative body, and not just a gathering-place where people come from ninety constituencies for a few weeks, and pass the bills which the government is pleased to present for consideration.

I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to make a much more considerate and satisfactory reply to the question by my hon. friend for East York (Miss Macphail).

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that I do not think this government, or any government, has provided or thought of providing accommodations for the lounge room, if you might call them that. We have provided an opposition room, which you have, and any equipment which you need this government is quite anxious to see that the opposition gets it.

When the third party came in we started a third room, and we supplied it with certain office equipment. That, I think, is only fair and right, that any group here should have reasonable office supplies in their offices. But I have been of the understanding on this question that the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) was of the opinion that we should install in the big opposition room, filing cabinets for each and every hon. member. That has not been the policy of this or any other government.

In regard to some of the other things which were mentioned, might I say that we are only too happy in this department to take care of certain other facilities for the building, such as seating arrangements in the dining room, as soon as we can purchase them. It is most difficult to get a lot of that equipment at the present time. It has been, since the war, but if you like a filing cabinet, we certainly want to accommodate you with it.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (CCF York East): Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) point to one drawer of a filing cabinet for a private member. I have been a member in the other House and have never heard of a member not having a drawer in a filing cabinet. I can hardly get my desk closed now. You have to keep some sort of order. It is quite impossible to keep things in order without a filing cabinet. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is well supplied, at least he has one filing cabinet, but that has nothing to do with the private members. The private member of this party and the private members of the Liberal Party have not any filing cabinets. It is a funny thing if the Province of Ontario cannot supply us with a few filing cabinets. Do they expect us to buy them ourselves out of the magnificent salary we receive? It is ridiculous.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) —do you want to speak?

MR. DOUCETT: No, go ahead.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to ask you two general questions in regard to the review you have made. Would you like to answer—

MR. DOUCETT: After what you have to say, I will answer the two of you at one time, if I can.

MR. DENNISON: My question is this. You mentioned your department was preparing to build dams on the East River. I notice there is an item here under the general heading of Dam Supervision, and Repairs and so on,—

MR. DOUCETT: What number is that?

MR. DENNISON: 168, but the Minister did mention the proposed dam the department intended to build on the East River. What I would like to ask is, approximately how many dams are now under supervision of your department and on what rivers are they located?

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Chairman—

MR. DENNISON: Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) answer that question?

MR. DOUCETT: That is a big question. I could not give you all the dams. We have so many of them.

MR. DENNISON: You are not able to answer?

MR. DOUCETT: I can get you the information.

MISS MACPHAIL: I might say, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it would be difficult to answer my question. How many filing cabinets have private members in this House? That is not difficult.

MR. DOUCETT: I do not know how I can answer an hon. member over here and another hon. member over there. I do not want to be rude—

MR. MACLEOD: I would just like to say a word to amplify what the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) said. I am mindful of the fact that it is only a few years ago that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) sat on this side of the House, and when they sat over here they had to suffer the same inconvenience which they are imposing on hon. members who sit in opposition today. I think for that reason, the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) should not just treat lightly what is put forward as a very serious proposition by the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail). As she stated in the House a few days ago, we over here are in an extremely fortunate position, if I might say so, because we have a place up there in the former projection room—it does not have very much fresh air and you do feel as if you are in jail when you are in there, but fortunately we are better off than the vast majority of hon. members on this side of the House. Now, I do not think it is beyond the genius of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) to solve this very simple problem for the private members. I cannot believe that you cannot lay your hands on a number of filing cabinets that could be put in the large room now occupied by the official opposition. You could do that, you are solving tremendous problems all the time, and you are a man of outstanding ability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: I am convinced that if you made up your mind that at 9.00 o'clock tomorrow morning you are really going to bite into this problem you could have these filing cabinets installed there within 24 hours. I believe that. You know it, and I do not think you should just lightly toss aside a proposal made by a distinguished hon. member of this House (Miss Macphail) who to the knowledge of all of us, is put to great inconvenience in her endeavour to serve one of the largest constituencies in the Province of Ontario. I would appeal for the solicitude of my friend the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) in this.

MR. DUNBAR: You love me, eh?

MR. MACLEOD: When you were in opposition you were an extremely active member. True you sat in the back concessions, as I recall it, and you did not

have a place to lay your head. You did not have a filing cabinet or any of these things. Now you are very comfortably ensconced in a fine office with a nice carpet on the floor and a fine mahogany desk. As a matter of fact, you have two offices, you can commute from one to the other. Do try to have a little sympathy.

MR. DUNBAR: A nice couch and all accommodation. Why not come in some time and have a rest?

MR. MacLEOD: I would come in and sit on that couch some time, but you become so violent I do not know what would happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: I would say to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) you are an extremely able and competent Minister of the province and should really get this done. I think if you solved this very real problem concerning the average private member, you would be demonstrating to the public of this great province of ours your fitness to occupy the Prime Minister's chair after the 27th of April.

Vote 160 agreed to.

On Vote 161.

MR. R. SCOTT (CCF Beaches): Mr. Chairman, there is a matter I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) and I hope he will not toss it aside as a secondary thing. It does not concern me at all, it concerns the page boys of the House. I know all hon. members will agree—this is under General Building?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Vote 161.

MR. DOUCETT: Page boys are not in public work.

MR. SCOTT: Do they not come under Legislative Assembly?

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker.

Votes 161 and 162 agreed to.

On Vote 163.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 163, do I understand that we actually spend $6,500 a year to service one apartment in this building? We spend $6,500 a year to service that one apartment?

MR. DOUCETT: Is that 163?

MR. MacLEOD: Yes. We spend $6,500 to service that one apartment? Well, surely we should spend a little money as well to service the apartment or the "hayloft" or whatever you want to call it, the only room assigned to the party which constitutes the official opposition in this building.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say, Mr. Chairman, this includes two employees' salaries in this item of Vote 163, The Lieutenant-Governor.

Votes 163 to 165, inclusive, agreed to.

On Vote 166.

MR. W. DENNISON: I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) in the building of these buildings that he outlined earlier under this item, does his department do the actual building or do they let it out to contractors? Were the buildings you are now putting up in Guelph built by yourself?

MR. DOUCETT: I may say, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) that we contract some of them, some of them we let on a lump sum of fixed basis and some of them we built ourselves. It depends on the type of building.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 166, is this where the Ontario Hospital at New Toronto comes in?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to know from the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) what is intended to be done. Are you going to extend the premises out there or is there going to be some consideration given to moving that institution?

MR. DOUCETT: If the municipality does not give us a building permit we

may have to do something else. However, I have not gone into the legality of that angle as yet. If they do not want a hospital or that home there some decision will be made. However, that is our plan, we have to be prepared for years ahead.

MR. DOUCETT: We have developed plans and could not get the material, and went ahead with this in mind, this being a long sought objective in the minds of the Department of Health, who have been wanting it a number of years.

MR. C. H. MILLARD: (CCF York West): You mean they want to move the building? They want a place somewhere else?

MR. DOUCETT: Oh, no. I said the items which I mentioned, such as the kitchen, and I think I mentioned a dining-hall, and they are in need of a nurses' quarters out there as well, in fact, the foundation was put in many years ago, I think.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could enlighten the House about his plans for the construction of the other block on the eastern side of this building, in other words, the eastern block? We spoke on it for a number of years, and I remember a few years back the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) informed the House that because of shortages it could not be planned, but if that could be undertaken, it would undoubtedly solve many problems for the departments of government and in an indirect way, perhaps solve some of the problems the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) indicates. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) could at this time indicate his plans for construction of the second east block?

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, I would say that the department have plans completed for this development, but due to the very serious housing situation, we would have to put many families out in order to move our garages to project the east block south. That is one of the main reasons which is holding up the project now, as well as the shortage of some of the very essential materials.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, under 166, there is $4,000 for travel and publicity. That is a growing industry in the province and one which pays big dividends, and I was wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) thinks that is enough to spend on that growing industry. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that is for huts, booths, whatever you may call them, small buildings, but I think we should put up some suitable building at least at the border points to handle our tourist trade.

MR. DOUCETT: I would like to say that is just for repairs, that item.

MR. HOUCK: I see.

Votes 166 and 167 agreed to.

On Vote 168.

Mr. G. B. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): Mr. Chairman, during my remarks on the Throne Speech, I brought out the fact that three narrow bridges that exist on Highway 39, the Duce River bridge, Belle River bridge and the Mill River bridge. At that time they were "death traps," far too narrow, much narrower than the Highway itself.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say, Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) would leave that until the Highway Estimates, we may be able to give him some information.

MR. ELLIS: Does that not come under Maintenance?

MR. DOUCETT: No, that is Highways.

Votes Nos. 168 and 169 agreed to.

On Vote No. 170.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (CCF Port Arthur): I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) if it is the intention of his department to expand facilities for a registry office at Port Arthur this year?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, I mentioned that.

MR. ROBINSON: You hope to do that this year?

MR. DOUCETT: I think we will.

Votes Nos. 170 and 171 agreed to.

On Vote 172.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Chairman, I wondered if this Item 2 in 172, should not be under the Department of Planning? It seems to me to be a job the Department of Planning should be doing.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Under what vote?

MR. DENNISON: No. 172, Item 2.

MR. DOUCETT: Item 2.

MR. DENNISON: Yes, "Grants towards—"

MR. DOUCETT: No, that has always been under Public Works.

MR. DENNISON: Well, this is a new item. Some of these are parts of a new item. It seems we have one department drawing the plans, giving the authority, and another department providing the grant. It just does not seem consistent.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L, Wellington North): Mr. Chairman, in connection with that item, what expenditure is being spent each year towards the upkeep or the maintenance of the present dam that has been constructed under The Grand River Conservation?

MR. DOUCETT: You mean the Shand Dam?

MR. McEWING: The Shand Dam.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, I can tell you what we have paid for the Grand River this year, that is, to the commission. Where they spend it, of course, I am not too sure; they might have spent some on the dam. I think that amount was small, $4,300, and I think $85.00, something like that.

MR. McEWING: You do not know whether that went towards the maintenance of the Shand Dam or went towards the development of the Conestoga Dam, do you?

MR. DOUCETT: Pardon?

MR. McEWING: You do not know whether that went towards the plans and preparing for the Conestoga Dam—that went to the Shand Dam or to the commission, and they used it as—

MR. DOUCETT: Oh, it goes to the commission.

MR. McEWING: You do not know where they use it?

MR. DOUCETT: No, I would not know exactly where they use it.

MR. McEWING: This amount which is being voted here, $350,000, represents 37½ per cent. of what portion of the estimated cost, do you know?

MR. DOUCETT: Pardon me?

MR. McEWING: This $350,000 in Item 2 of Vote 172, represents I presume, 37½ per cent. of the portion that will be spent this year, is that it?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, we have that amount in there, in one place, but I am not in a position yet to say just what they are going to spend. I think they are going to run into a little difficulty because both governments contribute there.

MR. DENNISON: I think the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Welsh) might be able to answer that question, Mr. Chairman. Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) answer that question?

MR. DOUCETT: What question do you want answered?

HON. G. A. WELSH (PC Minister of Planning and Development): I am sorry, I do not understand the question.

MR. DOUCETT: "Before proceeding with a scheme, an authority shall file plans and a description thereof and obtain the approval in writing of the

Minister of Lands and Forests, the Minister of Planning and Development and the Minister of Public Works"; is that the answer you want?

MR. DENNISON: The three of them?

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, am I correct that this amount, $350,000, is for the development of the Conestoga, which is also under the Grand River Conservation Commission? I understand that the Fergus Dam, which was the former Shand Dam, is now completed; are they doing further development on that dam?

MR. DOUCETT: No, the Fergus is completed.

MR. BROWN: That is what I thought.

MR. DOUCETT: And had cost over $2,000,000.

MR. BROWN: That is right. Then, what is the $350,000, is that not for the Conestoga?

MR. DOUCETT: Pardon?

MR. BROWN: Is that not for the Conestoga, then, which is also operated by the Grand River Conservation?

MR. DOUCETT: The estimate for the Conestoga is $3,812,000.

MR. BROWN: But this is the amount for this one year, is it?

MR. DOUCETT: Pardon?

MR. BROWN: This is for this year?

MR. DOUCETT: That is the amount we have in there, yes. We will be able to pay them more, if they need it.

MR. McEWING: Does their request make any mention of the Luther Marsh Dam or not?

MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, I might say for the benefit of the hon. members opposite, there seems some misconception about it. In the Estimates of The Department of Planning and Development, there are certain sums used for preliminary work on all these projects, and then when plans are completed and passed by the various departments concerned, that is, Public Works, Lands and Forests and my department, then the work is turned over and our data on it, to the authority which carries on from there. However, we actually do the preliminary work and pay for it in our Estimates in the Department of Planning and Development.

MR. McEWING: The $4,000, then, which was passed this year, is it for preliminary work or what is it for? You say your department pays for the planning and development, the preliminary work.

MR. WELSH: That is right, but these payments are made through the Department of Public Works.

MR. McEWING: Oh, I see. Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) know whether the commission plan on doing anything with the Luther Marsh Dam or not?

MR. DOUCETT: All I know is that they plan on going ahead this year, and they are very desirous that they be able to get along with the work. If you are interested, I will be glad to read you a letter which I wrote to the Dominion Government in February, in connection with the Grand River Conservation Commission.

"To the Minister of Public Works,
"Dear Mr. Fournier:

"Reference is made to your letter of June 20, 1947, in which you advised that the dominion would pay 37½ per cent. of the cost of surveys and foundation testing for the proposed construction of a dam on the Conestoga River.

"I am informed that this work has now been completed and the commission is now desirous of proceeding with the construction of the dam on the Conestoga, near Glen Allen.

"The estimated cost of the proposed work is $3,812,000. The commission has waited on the hon. Mr. Welsh,

Minister of Planning and Development, and has made a formal request for assistance from the province toward the cost of this work. They have also requested that this department communicate with you to ascertain if the dominion is agreeable to the continuing of financial aid in this project.

"The construction of this dam is of primary importance to the safeguard of the health, property and well-being of the rapidly increasing population within the Grand Valley, now in excess of 365,000.

"I understand the construction of this dam, if proceeded with, will take at least two years to build, and any financial assistance given would be spread over this period. The province is providing a sum of money in the Estimates for the fiscal year 1949-50, to give financial assistance to the commission to carry out this work, if the dominion is agreeable to make a contribution of a like amount. It is proposed that the two governments contribute 37½ per cent. each towards the cost of the work, the remaining 25 per cent. to be shared among the benefiting municipalities.

"I am forwarding under separate cover a copy of the engineer's report, together with the plans of the Conestoga project.

"I should appreciate if you would advise if the dominion will contribute the 37½ per cent. towards the cost of this work, being a like amount on the same basis as contributed by the province.

"Yours very truly,"

That letter is signed by myself and written under date of February 28, 1949.

Yesterday I had this letter delivered to me, which was written by the hon. Minister at Ottawa, under date of March 18th:

"Dear Mr. Doucett:

"On The Grand River Conservation Commission Conestoga Dam Project.

"I have your letter of February 28th, stating you are providing a sum of money in the Estimates for the fiscal year of 1949-50, to give financial assistance to the commission to carry out the above noted work on condition that the Dominion Government is agreeable to making a contribution of a like amount.

"The work on the first part of this scheme was divided on the basis of 37½ per cent. paid by the province and also by the dominion, the remaining 25 per cent. being shared among the benefiting municipalities.

"We have already contributed to the extent of 37½ per cent. of the cost of preparing plans for the proposed Conestoga project, which, according to the most recent report, is estimated to cost $3,800,000.

"It is felt that for the present the demand for labour and materials on other more urgent projects is such that we should refrain from proceeding with this particular work until such times as these items are in more liberal supply. At a later date, when the demand is decreased, we will be pleased to give further consideration to this project."

And it is signed by the hon. Minister. That is the latest correspondence, Mr. Chairman, which we have had from Ottawa. They are not in favour of continuing with the project this year, as requested in my letter of February.

MR. McEWING: I am glad the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) gave us that information. That is what I have been trying to find out for some time from the department.

There is one question I asked, and which I do not think the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) understood; possibly he does not just understand the situation up there.

There are two dams under consideration, one is the Luther Marsh Dam and the other is the Conestoga Dam. That is why I was asking if there was anything done about the Luther Marsh Dam in the way of plans and preparation. It is a small amount compared to the other. I think the dominion

will not hesitate to participate in it at all.

MR. DOUCETT: I might say, Mr. Chairman, as far as I know or as far as our department is aware, we have not heard of that dam. They have not spoken to us about the Conestoga. If it is a small project, probably it is something they have "lumped in," but they have given us the item of $3,812,000, and when that was done that is why we wrote Ottawa as we did.

MR. McEWING: Might I add just one word to that, but I assume that it does not cover the Luther Marsh Dam? The Luther Marsh Dam is practically all a clay constructed dam, and will not be an expensive dam for the amount they secure, the benefit they secure out of it. It seems you find in the Highways Department you get some hard work, but clay work is just as cheap as it was years ago, and this dam can be worked in the same manner; the other dam, however, is entirely a concrete dam.

MR. DOUCETT: The Luther Marsh Dam would be built of what? Would it not be built of the same material?

MR. McEWING: Built of which?

MR. DOUCETT: Would it be built of a different type of material?

MR. McEWING: Yes, it is almost entirely of clay—all except the gates.

MR. DOUCETT: Then that would not be put in.

MR. McEWING: No, I do not think it is in there.

MR. DOUCETT: Not in the item of construction.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo) North: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give this government full credit for putting $350,000 in the Estimates to take care of Conestoga. I am not sure I could give the government at Ottawa credit for the type of letter they have written to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett). I am just wondering if the $900,000 is in the same category, and, if so, whether the total amount of $1,250,000 should probably be struck from the Estimates for this year?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it will be necessary to do that, because it is not to be voted for that particular item.

MR. BROWN: How about the $900,000? Is that the same?

MR. DOUCETT: Well, it is quite possible they might change their minds on the other. We have to do a lot of "nagging" and urging and so on to get them to come through, you know.

MR. SALSBERG: As with all governments.

AN HON. MEMBER: Even yours, Joe.

Vote 172, agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report certain resolutions.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, before that proposal is entertained, may I ask, on a point of privilege, that I may make a statement to the House with your permission?

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you state your question of privilege, please?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes. Earlier on this evening when I brought to the attention of the House a situation existing with the motion picture censorship board—

MR. FROST: I do not think that is a question of privilege. I may say this: If my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg)—

MR. SALSBERG: You were not—

MR. FROST: I was busy outside and he came behind the Speaker's Chair to speak to me. I will see him about that correspondence personally, and

then if he wants to bring it up later, all right.

MR. SALSBERG: You see, the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) shows that he knows.

MR. FROST: Well, you came to be behind the Chair.

MR. SALSBERG: That is right. You do know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down, sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: Don't wake yourselves up.

MR. FROST: I will deal with that later on.

MR. SALSBERG: It is unfair to yourself to disturb yourself at this hour. Mr. Chairman—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is out of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, if you permit me to finish speaking—

THE CHAIRMAN: Only if it is a matter of personal privilege.

MR. SALSBERG: That is right. The hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) declared—

AN HON. MEMBER: That is just a question of opinion.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) declared to the House that my statement was incorrect. Now —

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order.

MR. SALSBERG: But I am not out of order, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, you are.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, as a matter of fact, the Chair agreed with me beforehand I was in order, and that I would be given the floor. It was agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: I am out of order now?

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think you should be fair about this. If you would let the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) complete his very short statement, he will be finished.

His veracity was challenged earlier this evening by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) when he made a statement. Why not give him two minutes to state his case?

MR. FROST: After all, I want to be reasonable with the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg). I will see him personally. I am quite familiar with the point which he raised. It is one of these "hair-splitting" things which is going to lead to a prolonged argument about nothing.

MR. SALSBERG: No, just a statement.

MR. FROST: I will say this, that I will gladly go over it with him and explain it to him and will help him out of his difficulty.

MR. SALSBERG: But I want to explain it to the House, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: Because the statement was made to hon. members of the House, and I want an opportunity of clearing up a statement which was incorrectly made about me.

MR. FROST: That is privilege.

MR. SALSBERG: I will rise tomorrow on a point of privilege before the Orders of the day, and if I am denied it again, then I will bring it up on another occasion.

MR. FROST: I suggest the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) tomorrow bring in a motion to impeach me.

MR. SALSBERG: That I would not do, because we would get a worse one in your place.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): I do suggest if on reading of *Hansard* it shows that hon. member's veracity was challenged, then he would have a point of privilege.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then I suggest we leave it at that. I would like to look at *Hansard* first; if his veracity was impugned, he has a point of privilege.

MR. SALSBERG: I will deal with it tomorrow then.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, The Committee of Supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions, begs leave to sit again, and moves its adoption.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call certain orders here. I greatly regret the hour is as late as it is, but we got badly behind schedule, and I have been anxious to get the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) back on to those fields of his.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): I have not made a complaint up to now. I am perfectly willing to sit here all next week rather than to rush all night.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will be here anyway.

MR. FROST: With respect to these items proposed, we were endeavouring to work out a reasonable space to give our hon. friends opposite time to discuss certain bills here. I think there are certain bills here that may not be, under all circumstances, perhaps, too controversial. I would call Order No. 50.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 50th Order; second reading of Bill No. 45, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," Mr. Thomas (Ontario).

MR. FROST: Go ahead, please.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (CCF Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I realize the edge has been taken off this bill by the one presented this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). Of course I would prefer to think the introduction of that bill today was more by accident than design. While it contains some concessions, I do not think it goes far enough.

In asking support for this bill, I speak as one engaged in industry in between sessions. If due consideration be given to the bill, I think it should be supported and the present legislation amended in the light of present-day conditions.

The maximum at the present time is $2,500, and if we take 66⅔ per cent. of that amount, it means the injured worker is expected to live on $30 a week. I wonder how many hon. members in this Legislature, if injured during their employment in industry, would like to live on that amount? Especially in these days when the cost of living is so high.

This is a disablement compensation, and, of course, the $30 a week is the maximum, but there are many workers earning well below that $2,500. I think the manufacturer should be able to carry this additional charge from the profits referred to by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) the other day, while I feel the worker in industry is entitled to full compensation.

There are many arguments one could use in favour of the 100 per cent. compensation for injured workers, and I think the 66⅔ per cent. is totally inadequate, because the injured worker needs, not less money but more money than when in good health.

Compensation should be paid from the date of the injury, without a waiting period. One thing we would like to see deleted is the 7-day waiting period. One very bad feature is that during the present 7-day waiting period, if a worker

is injured and is compelled to lay off the job for five or six days and then return to work, no compensation is paid.

I feel this clause should be deleted from the Act.

The present Workmen's Compensation Act is regarded by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) as the best of its kind to be found in any country. I believe the Act is a very good one, but if we consider the high cost of living and the average salary earned today, I think this adjustment is about due.

In the name, Mr. Speaker, I feel this bill deserves the consideration and the support of this government, and I move second reading of the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. C. DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this Act, as proposed by the hon. member has been considered in this House in previous years, and I would recall to the attention of the hon. members that this afternoon I introduced a bill that contains certain amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act. That was not by accident, Mr. Speaker. That was after very, very careful consideration, because I feel that the Workmen's Compensation Act—especially since this government has been in office, has been gradually and steadily and progressively improved. That is, it has been improved as to the benefits that accrue to the injured workman. Now, after consideration—and I say it has now been considered by me for at least two years —I have felt that in view of all the circumstances, which I cannot go into in detail tonight, that we might raise the percentage of payment to the injured workman to 75 per cent. But I must say, in my opinion, to raise the payment to 100 per cent.—and in addition there would be the reduction in the Income Tax—I almost think, Mr. Speaker, that that is frivolous; that the member could hardly be serious. It would be absolutely impossible to operate the Workmen's Compensation on a 100 per cent. basis, because, you know, Mr. Speaker, we are all human, the workers are human, and it would be very difficult to get a man to go back to work if he were in a better financial position by not working than he would be, working. There must always be, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, a difference that creates in the mind of the workers, a desire and, if necessary, a necessity to go back to work to regain his former position financially. I do not see how the Workmen's Compensation could be considered on any other basis.

Now, the question of shortening the period of time. That is, under the present regulation 7 days is the time required. Now, as I pointed out before, the policy of the present board operating and administering the Workmen's Compensation Act is, that if a man is injured on the day he may be injured and paid for that day, which I presume in most cases he is, we count that day, we count Saturday and Sunday, which he would not work in any event, and if there happens to be a holiday we count that. So, on the average, the workman is only required to be out of work about four days at the most.

Now then, there is legislation in one of the provinces that says three days, but I believe our Act is more favourable to the workmen than under that, because that requires three full days out of work, and so if a man were injured, say, on a Friday, that day would not be counted, Saturday and Sunday would not be counted. It would be the following Thursday before he would get credit for a full three days. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is plenty of room for argument against changing the number of days required, and certainly in that case it would not be feasible, it would not be sensible to not have some restrictions so that a man could simply wish to have a little time off and complain that he had hurt himself, and before it can be decided whether he had or not, he could actually be on compensation, and he probably wanted to go to a baseball game or something. Now, Mr. Speaker,

I say that and I say that in a frivolous way because I think in general the workers are reasonable, sensible fellows, but there is maleringering under the Compensation Act as we have had, and if we made it so perfect as this Act would be, it would be an impossible Act to administer.

I cannot say any more about this particular Act now, because there are four others and I intend to be very brief in my remarks, but the government cannot accept this bill.

MR. PARK: I just want to add a few words to the remarks that have already been made on this issue. I am glad that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) acknowledges that this is the "perfect" Act and that the amendments that the government brought in must therefore be regarded as somewhat imperfect, although I must say to those who represented this group in the House in previous years before I arrived here that it must be some compensation in the action of the Minister today in bringing in the bill, that we have not yet seen in detail, in that the job they have done year by year representing this case, has at least brought the government into taking some action on the Workmen's Compensation issue. I want to say to the Minister (Mr. Daley) on the question of the Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board —to which I am going to refer in my remarks—that I have here a copy that was tabled earlier in the session. I think when these reports are tabled, particularly when legislation involving a department is before the House, that every effort should be made to make these copies available to every member. I suppose because of that situation I have the only copy that exists in the House, but I got it earlier from the Clerk today to look at some matters in this respect, and I suggest to the hon. Minister who is responsible, that when the Workmen's Compensation Report comes down in the future that he make it available to every hon. member in the House.

One thing that struck me in a quick look through this particular report is the board has now a big folio of investments, according to the chartered accountants something like over $18,-000,000, which was confirmed by a chartered accountant, as being on hand. A great amount of that is to be found in the Accident Fund of the Compensation Board. Even allowing for a liability for potential claims against it, there is still $20,000,000 left in the "kitty" of the accident section. I suggest to the Minister that the principles that are involved in the bill moved by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) deserve a little more consideration than he has given it. It is true that he has made a few halting steps today to bring the Workmen's Compensation Act up to a little better basis than in the past, and on that score I want to congratulate him that he has been able to go even that far.

But the question in the elimination of the waiting time, is something that I think he cannot so glibly pass over, as he did this evening. If, every time a man gets injured he has to look for a holiday, apparently, in order that he can cut down the amount of time against which he will wait in order to be eligible for Workmen's Compensation. The main argument of the Minister, as I listened to it, is that one must have an incentive to return to work. He said, I think, "if necessary there must be a necessity" for a man to return to work under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Now, I suggest to the Minister (Mr. Daley) that it is required under the Act that medical examination exists and if a doctor is not prepared to attest that the man needs continued medical attention, then the Compensation Board does not pay, even at the present time.

Even at 75 per cent, or 66⅔ per cent. rate, as at the present—and of course not 100 per cent. rate—without a medical examination and without medical evidence, the Board would not continue to pay a man. The suggestion about malingering is much less important than I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) makes it out to be. I

suggest to you if you are creating this condition which makes the necessity of returning to work, because the Workmen's Compensation is not being paid, you are creating a condition which may lead to difficulties in the future, in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Board. If you create a situation where out of necessity a man has to go back to work because of that necessity, then you are creating a situation which will cost the Workmen's Compensation Board more in the end than if you had prepared to pay him the full compensation, to make sure he and his family would enjoy whatever the level of their income was.

I do not think there is very much more needs to be said about this bill—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: If my hon. friends think that by waiting until half-past twelve at night they will stop discussion on these bills, they are wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: Let us get that straight to start with. We can last as long as they can. We introduced this measure, and we insist it be given proper consideration by the government. There is no moral reason I have ever heard advanced—and I do not think there is any economic reason — why the level should not be raised to 100 per cent. Although the government has made some start it is not enough, and if we take issue with them this year, and keep on taking it, we hope they will take steps, which are necessary, and I can assure you that this resolution will be presented again and again until this government is prepared to grant 100 per cent. to the workmen of this province.

MR. J. D. BAXTER (L Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I cannot go along with this Act as it is, for several reasons. In regard to the first part, section 1; the seven days as it stands now is not fair in that it deprives the worker of his remuneration for too long a period. On the other hand I must agree to a certain point with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) that to cut it out entirely creates a condition which is the exact opposite and causes the workers to be, to a certain extent, careless. I have every sympathy with workmen in industry today who become injured. I have worked with men and women in industry for almost 20 years, and I know the problems which they have to contend with in regard to accidents. But I also know that while the Workmen's Compensation Board and the Factory Act provides every possible protection for workers, from any type of injury, whether from machine or any other type, nevertheless, there is this human element which enters into it, and I have had enough experience to convince me that there has to be, of necessity, a certain financial possibility hanging over their heads, to make them realize that if they are careless they are liable to suffer not only physically, but materially as well. I have seen time and again where a workman had it not been for the fact that he realized that he was going to lose a certain amount of money just for a very small injury, would immediately go on compensation. I have had them come into me and say: "I ran a truck over my foot, and it is hurting, I think I will have to go home." I do not insinuate for a moment that workmen are "putting it on" at all, but I have found out in many cases that in the case of a small injury, where if the waiting period was to be reduced or eliminated, and they were to get 100 per cent. compensation, they would immediately go on compensation. I believe it is essential for all of us that we get our share of what this bill provides, because if we go all out, and we reduce the responsibility economically, and we protect the workmen, which is just as great a safeguard as those we put on machinery. There are workmen quite careful, but they get to a point where they get pretty tired some times, and receive a small injury, and it gives them a holiday. I suggest that while

this bill, as several of the hon. members have intimated, will lead possibly to bringing along another bill, which will bring us nearer the goal, but nevertheless, this bill goes too far in that 100 per cent. will remove the feeling of responsibility from the workmen, and to remove the waiting period entirely. For these reasons, I cannot go along with the bill.

MR. MILLARD: I want to say I get a little bit "fed up" and sick and sore and disgusted at the insults which are handed out to the working people of this province.

MR. DALEY: That is too bad.

MR. MILLARD: I think it is nothing but a sort of insult to think people will deliberately injure themselves to get time out. That has been the suggestion.

MR. DALEY: I did not say any such thing.

MR. MILLARD: But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that this bill is very reasonable, and I will give you the reasons why I think it is reasonable.

If a salaried worker goes off, you do not suggest he got sick deliberately, but you pay him his full salary. You do not penalize him because he happens to get sick. You give him his full pay, feeling they have earned it in a course of a year, and they are entitled to time off, to take care of their sickness, and get back to work. You do not think they are going to stay off longer than is necessary, because you give him his full pay. If a member of the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) department goes off sick, he does not suggest the worker will only get two-thirds or three-quarters of his pay. He gets his full pay.

MR. DALEY: They have their sickness allowance.

MR. MILLARD: They get their pay. And I am sure if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) goes off sick, he does not come back here and say: "I will only take three-quarters of my pay." No, he takes it all.

When people are off sick, that is when they need their full pay even more than they do when they are working, because if they are going to be short of pay, then they are going back to work, in many instances in spite of doctors' orders, before they should go back.

Secondly, the very fact that they are off for a period of time before they are paid, means they are penalized both ways, one because they happened to be injured, and secondly, because they have to lose a certain number of days' pay, and on their return they only get a portion of their first pay, and they are always behind—all the time. When they go back to work, Mr. Speaker—and I say this from my own personal knowledge—I know they go back not fitted to go on with their work.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you lose a day's pay?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MILLARD: They slip behind, because their pay is short, but their rent and living expenses go on, and it puts them in a position where they are more liable to have accidents than they were previously.

We have cases where big corporations —and I can give the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) the names privately—which invite their people to stay on the job, and pay them their full pay, rather than report an accident or a number of accidents, because it will increase the rates they will have to pay to the Compensation Board. As everybody here knows, I think the rates of payment by the Compensation Board is, to some extent, gauged on the number of accidents they have, and the amount of hazards.

MR. DALEY: I know, Mr. Speaker, there is a tendency on the part of industry to endeavour to keep the accident record down, but I think the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is going a little bit far when he says he pays them full

pay. They may have him a lighter job, something they could do in spite of the accident.

MR. MILLARD: My own personal experience is they bring them in, and pay them their full rate of pay, in order that they will not report the accident.

MR. DALEY: That is better than compensation.

MR. MILLARD: If the men are going to get off, and get their full pay, then they will not stay off the job as they should, in order that their recovery probably would be more complete.

There is nothing wrong with the suggestion, and I say again to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), that it is nothing short of an insult to the working people to suggest that because they get their full pay, the same as the salaried workers, they will malinger, and not have the incentive to go back to work. They are under a doctor's care, or they do not get compensation at all. You do not get compensation until you get a doctor's certificate that you have been injured. The Workmen's Compensation Board does not just hand out benefits because there has been an accident. They have to be convinced that it is a compensable case. I think it is quite wrong to think that because you give a person in the time of injury something that will help him to get better and get back and be able to take care of his commitments, that he will malinger. I think it is wrong in principle, to give a person his full indemnity for the time that he is off.

In regard to the waiting period; I do not think there is any question but what it is altogether too long at the present time. Why do you penalize a person who has been unfortunate enough to have an accident, by making him wait seven days. He can easily lose four or five days pay. Of course, if the accident happens at the end of the week, it will ease it a little, but if the accident happens on a Monday morning, he has to lose four or five days pay, before he can get any compensation whatsoever.

MR. DALEY: You appreciate if he has been working and it is definitely decided that he has been injured, his pay dates back, and he does not lose any pay at all.

MR. MILLARD: He may be only off three or four days, but if he is not off the entire seven days, including Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, he does not get any compensation for the time lost.

I say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that in many, many cases, our people are living so close to the line that they simply cannot afford to go through four or five days waiting, before they are able to go back to work and try to catch up. They cannot do that on the pay they are getting, and with the cost of living what it is at the present time.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is to be commended for the provisions of the bill as it has been introduced, but they do not meet the situation today. This bill (indicating) does, and I suggest that it be given very serious consideration. I believe the Compensation Board and the employers can do this thing, and they can meet these requirements, which are very necessary for the welfare of the working people under the present circumstances today.

There are many, many of them who are getting far less than they would be getting in the organized jobs, and they are just as prone to be subjects of accidents, as anybody else. I think that will be proven from the statistics of the Compensation Board itself.

I make a plea for these people, that they be given more compensation, more than the 75 per cent, or "upping" the amount from $2,500 to $3,000. It calls for $3,000; it calls for full certification by a proper medical authority, and it seems to me that it is entitled to the honest consideration of the hon. members of this House, including the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill wholeheartedly,

and to add my appeal to the government to consider it far more seriously than was shown by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley).

There is one point I want to make, and one only. I want to warn the hon. members, that if they begin their desk thumping now, they will not hasten things at all.

I consider this an important measure, and I am sure you do, too, in your own hearts, and from your own experiences.

The point I want to make is that it is no justification for refusing to accept the main premises of this bill, and bring it up to 100 per cent., by seeing that our compensation law and regulations are better than are to be found in most other places on the continent. That is true. We do not question it. But that is inadequate, as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) has said.

What should be borne in mind by the government, and by the hon. members is that by denying to the workers the full compensation when they are sick or injured, they are punishing in most instances his wife and his children. That is the point. It is not just the man himself. He may be in hospital, and is taken care of, but anyone who is at all close to his people, as all of us in this Chamber are, or we would not be elected—if we live in an industrial or semi-industrial district, we all know it is a fact, beyond question, that when the breadwinner is injured, through no fault of his own, while at work, his wife and his children and his home suffer.

Until now there was a loss of one-third of his income. Now it will be one-quarter of the income.

It is also known to practically all of us that the average worker's earnings are not enough to lay aside an amount to take care of the slack period, that is, the period between his injury and his complete recovery and return to work. That is what we must bear in mind. There are also individual workers who suffered. I mentioned the case here a year ago of a little girl who lost her fingers while at work, and her compensation was not sufficient to pay her board and her room while still unemployed, and the firm advanced her a loan of $50, and the first week after she returned to work they deducted $10 out of her pay on account of the advance they had made of $50.

These are problems we are all up against, and we should not try to escape from the fact; we should not refuse to face up to the situation, because our laws are better than they are elsewhere. They are better, but they are inadequate and insufficient. I think industry will not stop, if it is called upon to increase the percentage of its contribution, to make possible the payment of 100 per cent.

I cannot imagine anyone wanting to be taken seriously when he makes the statement that workers would take advantage, and sort of get themselves injured, and involved in an industrial accident, in order to collect the insurance. You might find the odd person who would do that, but the average worker does not want to be injured, but he wants to continue working, and earning his wages.

I suggest these are very salient points for consideration, and I feel that is one reason why we should vote for a complete 100 per cent. compensation.

MR. S. L. HALL (PC Halton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a moment in opposition to this bill. I would also like to ask anyone who is a supporter of this bill if they have ever worked in industry, and come under the Compensation Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

MR. HALL: I am very glad to hear that, because I happen to be one of those who have worked in industry and I guess I have been the subject of compensation as much as anyone here. I am, of course, very sorry to hear of anyone who has lost their fingers, and become disabled, but I am sure you will realize that some may be carrying injuries which cannot be seen.

I am 100 per cent. behind the gov-

ernment's bill, for the reason that if you go to the extent of giving 100 per cent. compensation, you are taking away the responsibility of citizenship. I am one of those individuals who has had to work all his life, for what little I have.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are not alone in this world on that.

MR. HALL: I appreciate the fact that I have had the privilege of earning my living. In fairness to the Compensation Board, I would like to say that anything which I ever suffered, which necessitated my coming under the regulations of the Compensation Board, that no one was ever used any better than I was. I suppose I will hear from the opposition side, "Oh well, he belongs to the government ranks." May I say, Mr. Speaker, that my accident occurred before ever I was a government member. That was the Compensation Board administered by those who sit on the opposite side of the House at the present time.

MR. NIXON: Thank you very much.

MR. HALL: I believe the Compensation Board is the best in existence, and I heartily agree with the hon. member for Prince Edward - Lennox (Mr. Baxter) that the bill proposed by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) is not a proper bill. Surely if a person has worked in industry, should feel it his duty to do his job to the best of his ability. Personally I have never worked on any job where I did not feel it was my duty to see that my work was of such a character that I could be proud of it.

At the time that I was forced to come under the regulations of the Compensation Board due to disability, I was very grateful that the concern for which I worked had paid enough in to the Compensation Board, so that I had the privilege of drawing. But while I was very pleased to be able to receive that, I took pride enough in my job so that I wanted to get back to work as soon as I could, and try to make a good job of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: So does every worker.

MR. HALL: No. I have worked too much to agree to that. I say that every worker does not. I have hired too much labour to agree with that. I suggest that in any job you must keep this in mind, that there are those, both on salaries and on daily wages, who want to earn their money in the easiest way possible and in many cases do not fulfill their duties in the way they should. I have hired too many people not to know that.

MR. THORNBERRY: You did not talk like that before the election.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HALL: I spoke like that before the election and I would like to remind the hon. members that I was not going around making election promises, and that is more than can be said about some of the hon. members in opposition, who canvassed my riding at the election.

I am certainly 100 per cent. in favour of the government bill, as I do—

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is not the bill we are discussing.

MR. THORNBERRY: The hon. member (Mr. Hall) only goes as fast as his Minister (Mr. Daley).

MR. PORTER: How fast do you go?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to say on this other than I have gathered, from what I have listened to here, that there is more agitation than practical knowledge of what the hon. members opposite are talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a very few words on this bill. I think all of us, no matter to what party we belong, are striving to improve the lot of all the people in the

province, and the various segments of our population. I do not think the desire to help the working men in regard to compensation or other benefits is confined to any political party in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: We seek to move, all of us, according to our lights, and to attain the end that in a broad sense will bring the greatest benefit to the greatest number of workers.

In regard to this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that the Workmen's Compensation Act in Ontario is a fine Act. I think the Act itself is an Act which stands out amongst others in any jurisdiction in the world.

I remember when Sir William Beveridge was over here some years ago, the man who fathered that great crusade from the cradle to the grave, he told us that at that time in his examination of the workmen's compensation laws in the various countries of the world, the conclusion he arrived at, after that examination, was that we in Ontario had the most advanced legislation in regard to workmen's compensation in the world. Perhaps we all agree with that. But no legislation is perfect unless it goes as far as we might wish it to go, and which, in the light of present conditions, it should go.

In regard to the benefits under our present Compensation Act, I have felt for some time that the benefits under that Act should be increased from the base of 66⅔ per cent. Last year in the House we of the Liberal Party moved precisely the same bill my hon. friend (Mr. Daley) moved in the House today, asking that the compensation be increased from 66⅔ per cent. to 75 per cent. There might be a very sound argument for going even beyond 75 per cent., but at the moment I would say to the hon. members of the House that we are at least moving in the right direction. In going to 75 per cent., we are going to progress; we are going toward the ultimate of 100 per cent. I am one of those who would say we should eventually reach the full 100 per cent. I think perhaps we might even go higher than the 75 per cent. in the days which lie ahead, but it seems to me that presently we are making reasonable progress in moving in the right direction, in regard to the suggestion in our bill which we placed before the House, and in the bill introduced by the government today. Therefore, for this reason, I cannot support the bill. The bill itself would give 100 per cent., and I cannot go that far at the moment.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything on this subject, because I believe the case has been well presented by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) and the hon. members for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) and West York (Mr. Millard).

However, I feel provoked into saying something in view of the callous and indifferent attitude of hon. members opposite.

MR. FROST: Nonsense.

MR. THORNBERRY: It is not nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) knows it, because the attitude adopted by the government on this matter is the same as has been adopted by a Tory party—

MR. FROST: Nonsense. Talk a little sense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. THORNBERRY: Their attitude is the same as that adopted not long ago in connection with family allowances, another social security measure, and the same as they adopted when workmen's compensation was originally brought in.

MR. S. L. HALL (PC Halton): We brought it in.

MR. THORNBERRY: It was the

same attitude then, the same attitude as when the Liberals brought it in. Where did the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Hall) vote then?

MR. FROST: It was a Conservative government that brought in workmen's compensation legislation.

MR. THORNBERRY: Who originated the bill? Let me tell you: it was Allan Studholme, the member for Hamilton.

MR. FROST: He is back home.

MR. THORNBERRY: And in order to get a few more votes in the—

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the hon. member (Mr. Thornberry) confine himself to discussion of the bill?

AN HON. MEMBER: I think he is.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what you think.

MR. SPEAKER: No, we are discussing the politics of hon. members opposite more than we are discussing the bill, I think.

MR. FROST: Just a lot of blather, just a lot of blather, that is all.

MR. THORNBERRY: I thank you for the latitude you have given me, Mr. Speaker. I will endeavour to stick close to the bill, but I do hope my remarks were relevant and related insofar as I was trying to prove that the opposition, at other times in the past, when it came to this and other similar measures, as I said, have opposed them in their original form. Old-age pensions—

MR. FROST: We brought that in.

MR. THORNBERRY: And on this bill, they will support it, not because they believe in it, but because they hope to garner a few votes on it.

MR. FROST: I do not think that is a very—

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Everything has been the same up to date.

MR. THORNBERRY: Yes, everything has been the same to date. Some other speaker said: "They must suffer materially as well as physically." Now, what kind of humane outlook is that, to suggest a man with a family "must suffer materially as well as physically?"

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the Tory idea.

MR. THORNBERRY: Of course it is. I know of cases such as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) mentioned. I worked at the Steel Company of Canada and saw dozens of cases where men were brought in on stretchers to stay there the whole day so that they would never get compensation. Yesterday we listened to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) explain at great lengths why the statutory allowance of $10,000 should be paid.

MR. FROST: And why we were not going to take it.

MR. THORNBERRY: Yes, with tears in his eyes he said: "We are going voluntarily to give it up."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: That is right, sure.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): How about the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe)?

MR. FROST: If the hon. member (Mr. Thornberry) will sit down, I will give him the rest of the "ten grand."

MR. THORNBERRY: If I thought the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) meant it, I would sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THORNBERRY: That is just another Tory promise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THORNBERRY: Some of the reasons he outlined, Mr. Speaker—

MR. PORTER: He knew you would not sit down.

MR. THORNBERRY: —was, the $8,000 was established in 1924—

AN HON. MEMBER: What has this to do with it?

MR. THORNBERRY: —and that cost of living had gone up to that extent. I suggest the workmen's compensation of 66⅔ per cent. was drawn up in a similar time, and the cost of living has gone up, therefore it needs a change upward.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Yes, but the wage rate has gone up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not that much.

MR. DALEY: The percentage is based on the wage rate.

MR. FROST: He does not know that.

MR. DALEY: He does know all about it.

MR. THORNBERRY: The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has made much of the claim it might beget more malingerers.

I do not think there is any cause for worry there. If this government had the welfare of its people at heart they would not be concerned with a few malingerers. We know they exist now and always will.

I have in mind some ten years ago, being in conversation with the Relief Commissioner of Hamilton, who admitted to me that 5 per cent. of the people on the rolls were "fakers," "but," he said, "I would much rather have those 5 per cent. there than to lose one per cent who would be deserving." That is the very attitude we should take with workmen's compensation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THORNBERRY: It is the greatest good to the greater number, and rather than any should suffer, let us not worry about the few malingerers who might get a few dollars. I suggest to you people back there, because I do not believe they are really all Tories, they just had the misfortune to be siphoned into the channel more than anything else, though they will be Tories if they stay there for a year or two—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: That is just the difference; now is the time you can show your independence. You can strike out and make this government do something that is worthwhile for the people. You have the control of this government at your fingertips. Control them; do not let them control you.

Therefore, I suggest this is a grand opportunity for those people to do something for Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: That will be the "frosty Friday."

MR. W. E. HAMILTON (PC Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, these remarks have been interesting, and, as one who in 1946 spoke on the speech from the Throne, and respectfully asked the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley)to, at an early date, give consideration to amending the Workmen's Compensation Act, to raise it to a level of 75 per cent., I would like to take part in this debate because I do not agree with the principle of 100 per cent.

I think if we divided ourselves into two groups, those who buy protection because we are not engaged in industry and are not benefited by workmen's compensation, and those who are engaged in industry, we will find that the level of the degree of compensation we would buy for ourselves, for loss of time and income, will not average more than $40 a week across the board.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. HAMILTON: On the $3,000 —I am coming to this bill—on the $3,000, which is the amendment of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), as against the 100 per cent. disability income which the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) advocates in his bill, my contention is that, in our own private administration of our own affairs, we would not buy—I would not buy—a replaceable income in excess of $40. As a matter of fact, dealing in the form of insurance, there is no firm which would insure a person against loss of income of more than 75 per cent., and as for 100 per cent., it is unthinkable.

MR. FROST: That is so.

MR. HAMILTON: I do not say a man in industry would become hurt in order to draw income. I think that is unthinkable and should be erased from the record as far as that goes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HAMILTON: This, Mr. Speaker, is a problem which all hon. members should give their honest attention to; it has taken this Legislature and other legislatures all these years to come from the point where the Meredith Report brought in the recommendation for the increase from $2,000 to $2,500, and now we find it placed at $3,000, and I assume at some future date it may even go higher, but it has taken all these years for public opinion, as represented by legislators in this House to agree even to that extent.

To suggest now 100 per cent, I think, is a trifle extreme.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as introduced by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) would, in my opinion, be just out of place at this time in the development of this country. I do feel if they would put the measuring stick on their own private affairs, the way they maintain their own affairs, how they would manage in industry, they would not buy replaceable income for that amount.

MR. MILLARD: How about the waiting?

MR. HAMILTON: If I were writing a bill, I would say five days. I do not just agree with the removal of it, because we are all human, and although I have never been under workmen's compensation at any time, I too know that there are people who spoil a good thing.

When a man meets with an injury, that man does not lose anything by the seven-day waiting period. If he is—I will use the expression a "lead-swinger" —he does possibly get himself a bit embarrassed.

In the main, to deal with the remark of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) who says that because incomes are not too large, and cost of living is large, Mr. Speaker, I doubt if you could ever bring in any measure which would be perfect; and I think if we went to the "no-waiting period" and the 100 per cent., the pendulum would have swung too far in that direction.

I do not agree with waiving the waiting period; I would like to see five days in the bill, because I think it would be a better bill.

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): Amend it, then.

The bill negatived on division.

AYES: 19
NAYS: 56

MR. FROST: Order No. 62.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 62nd Order; second reading of Bill No. 82, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," Mr. Dowling.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (CCF Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 82, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act."

MR. FROST: Same division?

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Same speech.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the only change in this bill is the raising of the maximum of $2,500 to $3,300. May I say in support of this bill, I regret I was not here when the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) presented his Workmen's Compensation Bill earlier this afternoon. However, I do feel in presenting this request for amendment to The Workmen's Compensation Act, this is the first change which has been made in the Act on the basis of the maximum, in six years.

I believe the bill was amended, or the Act was amended, in 1943, when it was raised from $2,000 to $2,500.

MR. DALEY: We did that.

MR. DOWLING: Although the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) takes credit in saying they had amended the Act at that time, the increase to $2,500 was made, I believe, as a measure in view of the increase in the cost of living and other things which were connected with it.

However, since that time the cost of living has risen 40 points from the living cost index and, on that basis—I have handled a considerable number of workmen's compensation cases and we have men in industry who are limited to a certain amount of money even though their earnings were higher than $2,500 or even higher than $3,000. I would like to tell the House I have been on compensation and I have been taken back in industry on account of the doctor in the City of Hamilton, because they wanted my time back, the doctor said I had to go back to work when I caught my hand in a machine. I objected to going back to work. However, I went back to work and I lasted 15 minutes on the job and I happened to have a brother a doctor, and he got in touch with this other doctor and I might tell you quite frankly that the other doctor mentioned that was a practice of certain professional men in the City of Hamilton to try and get men back on the job.

MR. DALEY: Was that recently that this happened?

MR. DOWLING: No, that was back in 1934.

MR. DALEY: We would not have a doctor like that on our list.

MR. DOWLING: No, you would not, but you did have. I pointed out in my maiden speech some of the doctors and I agree with the Minister that there are humanitarians on the Board. Here is a position where men working in industry, who are of the higher type, higher skill, their earnings are much higher than even $2,500, and $3,000, and I do not think industry even itself would object to it, and in fact I might say that members of the Compensation Board even suggested such a thing might be acceptable to industry if brought into this Legislature. I feel that the hon. members of this Legislature should go along with this proposition because it only equalizes right up the grade, the limits of percentage, and I would ask that they support that on this basis.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I think we have demonstrated over a period of years since 1943 that this government has never considered this Act as something that could not be improved, and I think recognized in 1943 that there were many things that could be done and set out to do them, and while I am not able at the moment to think of everything, it was this government that did raise from $2,000 to $2,500 on the maximum, and that this government established Malton, and I take this opportunity again of saying to any of the hon. members here that if they can possibly find time during this session of the Legislature to visit that institution and see what is going on in the interest and welfare of injured people in this province—

MR. SALSBERG: How about the Committee of Labour?

MR. DALEY: It increased the widow's and children's pensions at a cost of approximately $5,000,000 to industry, which has to be made up in three years. That additional money that

they have to throw into the pot over a period of three years, a total of approximately $5,000,000. We instituted the system of supplying all new and repairing of artificial appliances which has proved of tremendous benefit, and at some considerable cost, to all the injured people of this province. We have made a minimum of $100 a month disability no matter how much less than that a month a man may earn. I presume you realize that is for total disability. We have broadened the scope of the Act in dealing with industrial diseases, and have now covered a great many diseases formerly not covered that can be attributed to the nature of the work, and we have given the Act—I say this without fear of contradiction—that we have given the Act a most generous humanitarian administration and, I think, we, this government, can take credit, Mr. Speaker, for the tremendous improvements and benefits that now accrue to Ontario people in this province.

This government cannot accept this bill.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Daley) to say it was his government increased the basis from $2,000 to $2,500?

MR. DALEY: The session of 1944.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) one very simple question: how did you arrive at and why did you stop at $3,000? Why was the figure set at $3,000 rather than $2,500?

MR. DALEY: I might say we had a brief presented by one of the large organizations. We have had from all of the large organizations, requests for $4,000, and while in one—it was not a request—it pointed out that the amount might even be $6,000. But on examining the wage rates, the amount of money that the men are now earning, considering that where a man earns over $3,000 and is injured, that he does take a loss for that portion over that amount, but it seemed to me, and I so recommended to the government, that after investigation it seemed to me that $3,000—while it would not eliminate entirely all the difficulties, it was reasonably fair, and so that was the recommendation I made to the government.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to intervene in this debate, but we heard a few moments ago a couple of cocksure statements that it was the Progressive Conservative Government that increased the figure from $2,000 to $2,500 in 1944. I believe in going to the records for these things. I have here the Statutes of 1943, and I would refer the Minister and his colleagues to Chapter 37, Section 4, which reads as follows:

> "Section 11, Subsection 1 of Section 43 and Subsection 1 of Section 98 of The Workmen's Compensation Act are amended by striking out the symbol and figures '$2,000' wherever they occur in the said section and subsections and inserting in lieu thereof the symbol and figures '$2,500'."

The Act was assented to April 14, 1943. Session prorogued April 14, 1943.

MR. FROST: When did it become effective?

MR. PARK: It does not make much difference when it becomes effective. The question of who brought it in, is now pretty clear on the record.

MR. BLACKWELL: Don't be in such a hurry. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is going to mention—

MR. PARK: The Leader of the Opposition has taken good care of you today.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will tell you when it comes into force. "This Act shall come into force on the day upon which it receives the Royal assent," Section 10.

MR. BLACKWELL: When did it receive Royal Assent?

MR. JOLLIFFE: April 14, 1943, when my hon. friend the Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) was running around the province in opposition.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): If the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) in arriving at his conclusion as to what the amount of money should be in the proposal he presented to the House, and it is $500 less than the proposal presented by the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Dowling), if he had done some figuring based on the weekly salaries and wage earnings in this country, as reported in the *Labour Gazette,* I think he would have found this. Quoting the 75 per cent. figure on $3,000, he would have found the maximum, the highest allowance under Workmen's Compensation would be $2,250. If he had taken that as against the weekly salaries and wages—this is in the February, 1949, *Labour Gazette,* the last one available—he would have found that as of November 1st, 1948, the average salaries and wages was at $43.40, which worked out on a 52-week basis to $2,248.48. I believe that is correct, that is almost identical with 75 per cent. of the $3,000 figure he has given us. What he has done, is that he has taken the maximum wage, the maximum for Workmen's Compensation and actually set it down to the level of the average. That is what he figured as a consequence of the figures that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has presented to this House in this bill.

He is taking the worker who earns, and that is what matters because even on the workers' earnings he gets paid, if he has taken the week which is allowed, to around $3,000 to be taken at 75 per cent. and he reduced that worker to the average of all industry. What he does in the process is, he reduced the workers all around as a consequence.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) he might well reconsider, as I recall the brief presented to the Cabinet the other day. I think it was to that brief the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) was alluding a few minutes ago. As I remember the brief of the Trades and Labour Congress of Ontario, that brief called for $3,600 and I believe the government may yet have given greater consideration to that brief than he has done in bringing in the $3,000 figure. The figure presented by the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Dowling) would come much closer than the figure of $3,000 that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has included in his bill. For that reason I would suggest to him that he should give consideration to that measure.

Bill negatived on division.

AYES: 30
NAYES: 44

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 64th Order.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 64th Order; second reading of Bill No. 84, "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act," Mr. Walker.

MR. H. W. WALKER (L Welland): Mr. Speaker, in moving this bill to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act and hearing the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) bring out the bill to take in part of this particular bill increasing the difference to 75 per cent., we in this group of the House feel very grateful. At the same time we feel that consideration should have been shown to reducing the waiting period down to three days. We feel that the pressure brought to bear upon the doctors in the medical profession should consider the man's position, and the probabilities of his security, and he might give a man's condition as being one thing, where if the Act was brought down to three days, it might make the conditions in his home better, and the compensation would be smaller. Therefore, I would appeal to the government to reconsider this particular clause in this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word. I think the House will appreciate that there are two parts to this Bill No. 84, one part asking for the raising of the base from 66⅔ per cent. to 75 per cent. The government bill is meeting that requirement, as far as we are concerned.

The other section of the bill asks that the waiting period be reduced to three days. I believe we all could give very serious consideration to that. I entirely agree with the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Hamilton) that while we do not think it is in the best interests, generally speaking to cut the waiting period out entirely, there does not seem to be any legitimate or logical reason why we should not cut it in half, leaving the three days waiting period, instead of the present seven.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I really do not know what there is for me to argue about on this particular bill, because as the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) has said, the bill calls for the same percentage as the bill introduced by myself this afternoon.

We have already indicated in regard to a former bill our attitude as to the time period. I notice in this bill which has just been introduced, number 84, in paragraph 4, if I am reading it correctly, I think it would be far more disadvantageous to an injured workman than the advantage of having the time cut a little bit. This provision reads:

> "Where the board deems it more equitable, the board may award compensation for permanent disability, having regard to the difference between the average weekly earnings of the workman before the accident, and the average amount which he is earning or is able to earn in some suitable occupation after the accident, and the compensation may be a weekly or other periodical payment of 75 per centum of such difference, and regard shall be had for the workman's fitness to continue in the employment in which he was injured, or to adapt himself to some other suitable occupation."

If I interpret that correctly, that would be a tremendous cut from what we are presently doing. If a man is considered to be a permanent disability we pay him his full compensation, and he can go out and if he can make some additional money, he keeps it. We have men whom we consider totally disabled, who are making more money than they did before they were injured, in such activities as selling insurance, and that sort of thing, where a man who is handicapped can carry on.

I do not think the workers of this province would sell the different—

MR. OLIVER: Would not the first line of that paragraph relieve the difficulty there, "where the board deems it more equitable?" If it were not more equitable, the board would not so direct.

MR. DALEY: If the Act were passed with that clause in it, the board would not consider allowing a man to make more money after his injury than he did before, and still pay him the full compensation, which they do now. I do not think you would convince any Board they should do that, with that clause in there. At any rate, I have no desire to debate that particular clause at the moment. I must say the government is not prepared to accept this bill.

MR. THORNBERRY: Mr. Speaker, just one word from the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). I do not know how many cases he has in mind where an injured man would be drawing down more money than compensation by any part-time employment he might be able to do. I do not believe there are many cases. I believe there are far more cases in the opposite direction, of men who have been injured, and whose earning capacities have been destroyed. I have one in mind, of a foreign-born worker who could only work with a pick and shovel, who was working with the Hydro, and a pole fell across his foot, and injured him so he can never do the work he did before, with a pick and shovel. His earning capacity is taken away, and he is living on a pension of $29.75 a month. I think in

a case like that, he should be getting full compensation until such time as he can find something he can do, which he has not been able to do for the past ten years.

MR. DALEY: I would not venture on the number, but there are a goodly number.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (CCF Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one word with regard to the waiting period. It seems to me the difference between the day on which the man is injured on the present basis of seven days as compared to three days in this recommendation is the difference between what a man will get if he were put on compensation. We all agree that if a man is injured on a Friday, Friday is the starting the first day of the waiting period, and there is the subsequent Saturday and Sunday. It is a game of chance. It would be very unfortunate if a man were injured on a Monday, because he would have to wait for the full seven days. The three-day period is a compromise, and I think the government could go along with us, and they will not be saying to this House that a man is trying to malinger, for a mere difference of three or four days. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) should give this a chance, try it for one year, and if he can come back here next year and show us it did not work, we are prepared to come here and discuss it all over again.

MR. WALKER: I think, as an employer of labour myself, that this period of seven days is a little beyond the average need. When an employee has an injury, and he has lost two or three days, the doctor knowing his condition, and his family surroundings, keeps him on compensation for the limit of the time, and I admire the average doctor who does that—

MR. DALEY: We do not admire him. We would bar him right out. He would never deal with another compensation case, if we knew that he did it. I do not think the average doctor is doing that.

MR. WALKER: I would safely say that the doctor knowing the condition of the family—perhaps he is the family doctor—if a man had to wait the full seven days for compensation, he will continue the treatment for the time required by the Compensation Board. I repeat I admire a doctor who does that under those circumstances. I think the time lost by an employer would probably be more valuable in having this man back on the job in three days, than having him off. I feel this bill should be strongly supported, under those conditions.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) take the same vote?

MR. FROST: Yes.

Motion negatived.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: (PC Provincial Treasurer): 68th Order.

MR. THORNBERRY: Is the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) satisfied now that the motion is defeated?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 68th Order; second reading of Bill No. 36, "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act," Mr. Isley.

MR. T. H. ISLEY (CCF Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 36, "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides added protection against silicosis in two ways:

First, as a preventive measure, by providing that every workman who is in any industry exposed to silica dust, must be given a chest X-ray at least once a year. And where there is found some injury to the lung, but not enough to cause disability, he must be given an X-ray at least once every two months thereafter, so that if his condition grows worse it can be quickly checked.

Secondly, as a compensation measure, by providing that when a workman has been exposed to silica dust, and contracts any disability from a condition which could be attributed to silicosis, it is assumed that the disability is due to silicosis and he gets compensation accordingly. Also, if he later contracts any chronic lung disease, it is to be compensated for also.

The theory behind this proposal is that it is not always possible to say definitely whether a disease such as tuberculosis has been caused in part by lung injury from silica dust, and where the doctors say it could have been caused in this way, we should lean over backward in giving benefit of the doubt to the workman, because the disease may take many years from his life. And since any lung injury, even if it seems to heal, always leaves scar tissue where trouble can flare up again, we say that if any workman has a lung condition which could be due to silicosis, and it's serious enough to disable him for a time, and later develops a chronic lung disease, we should again give him the benefit of the doubt. A great many men who at one time or another have had a touch of silicosis, later develop tuberculosis, and it seems reasonable to assume that their defences against the disease were at least weakened because of the silicosis injury.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I find in my constituency a great number of silicosis victims. I am not going to quarrel with the Compensation Board, but I will cite a case of a man whom I know quite well, who has suffered terrible agony down through the years, caused by this disease. It started back in 1934, after working for 13 years in a foundry. At that time he was earning $20 a week. He was placed in a San at Freeport, and he left there in 1935 apparently figuring he was healed up. For four years while he was in that rest period, he was receiving compensation at the rate of $4.50 per week. In 1939, after this four years of rest, the Board felt he was sufficiently healed, and he went back to work, and worked for one year with the Hydro, and from there he went back to his old job in the foundry, not at the same job, but at a different plant. In 1947 he became totally disabled. That man is now receiving the full amount of $30 a month, but the fact is that during the time while his case was being re-opened, he suffered terrible financial loss. He is a man with a family, going to school.

MR. DALEY: I thought you said he was working during that time.

MR. ISLEY: No, there was one year while the case was being re-opened, during which he was not on compensation, and he was unable to work at all during that time. Oh, he did work part time, but was compelled to work less and less. Each week he was being cut down, and his chest expansion was decreasing.

This is a case of one unfortunate worker, and I think there should be something done to protect these people who are working under these conditions, and give them any X-ray benefits, when they work under such conditions. I do not think any man should be asked to work under such conditions and endanger his life. It is a slow death agony. I saw this man recently, and he is just a walking skeleton. It is really an agonizing death, and I think in the interests of the working people we should do something about it. I certainly will support this bill.

MR. DALEY: I appreciate things of the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley). I, too, wish there was something we could do to prevent this. But I would point out to him that in the particular area or field where this silicosis is most prevalent is, of course, in the mining areas. There they are following out about what the hon. member (Mr. Isley) suggests in his bill as regards the mines. In regard to other types of industry, where silicotic dust might be found, such as foundries and granite works and some stone-cutting plants, they are doing that sort of thing, and we have been endeavouring for some considerable time to find a basis upon which we could get

both employer and employee in agreement on what should be done.

I have had many conferences with manufacturers and with different people and with the Department of Health, also with foundry people of all kinds, endeavouring to work out something which would be an improvement over what we have. In the meantime, we are making tremendous strides, I would say, in endeavouring to prevent it—not to compensate for it, but to prevent it happening if possible, by good "housekeeping" in foundries, by mechanical devices to take the dust away from the machines and away from the buildings, to keep it off the floors and every way that is possible.

We find industry is highly co-operative in endeavouring to fight it from that angle, and I think today, with the administration of The Workmen's Compensation Board, silicosis is compensable, and if there is a degree of silicosis in a person's lungs, who later contracts tuberculosis, that is taken into consideration, and even to the slightest amount of silicotic dust found in a man's lungs, consideration is given when compensation is being awarded.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we are attacking this problem—and problem it is, I am not trying to minimize it a bit—in a way which appears to us to be the best way. I think we are having considerable success in eliminating the possibility of workers taking this disease.

Therefore, I cannot recommend to the government that we accept this bill, because I certainly prefer to go along the way we are.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) a question before he sits down?

I am not clear, from what he is saying, what he thinks about the X-ray proposal in this bill. Do I understand that he thinks, on the one hand, it is a good idea, that the mines do it, and on the other hand it is not a good idea and he cannot accept this proposal?

MR. DALEY: Yes, because, as I have said, I have had many consultations with both management and labour on this very question. Labour itself has never been entirely sold on the idea of being checked. There are men in a lot of these foundries who have worked there years and years; they might, under an X-ray, prove to have some slight amount of silicotic dust in their lungs, and it is quite possible if you examined every one of us in this House there might be some silicosis right here. However, at that time, there is no apparent ill effects, and these men are fearful they would be out of employment if silicotic dust were found, that management would no doubt feel they should get rid of them and get them out of there.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is the same argument which was used in defence of child labour. I am surprised to hear it here.

MR. DALEY: Well, I am not aware of what the argument was on child labour.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That people would not want to get out of work.

MR. DALEY: This is the argument of workers as well. On the other hand, management, because of the tremendous cost that The Compensation Board requires of them for this very thing—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, well—

MR. DALEY: They would be willing to do anything to cut down the cost, because that is where the money goes.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Then, why not be in favour of the bill?

MR. DALEY: Because, in the mines, they are doing practically that, and as I say, I have been working on this thing with different types of industrial activity with both management and labour, endeavouring to work out something which will eliminate—and that is what they are more interested in—eliminating, cleaning up these foundations. If you go through this country, you will

see tremendous progress has been made in good "housekeeping" and eliminating dust hazard. I think we are doing all that could be expected of us, and we are working with management and with the people who are absolutely concerned, both labour and management in connection with this disease.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But you agree X-rays are of value, do you not?

MR. DALEY: X-ray of value?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. DALEY: Oh yes, certainly.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Or the mines would not be doing it.

MR. DALEY: I beg your pardon?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Or, the mines would not be using the method.

MR. DALEY: The mines are doing it, yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. DALEY: However, it is a different proposition in an individual mine than it is in a granite works, where the same dust might be prevalent but not to the extent it is in a mine. I think eventually in connection with the Department of Health—we have had many consultations about this very thing; it is certainly not something which is being ignored, Mr. Speaker. Everything is being done that possibly can be done to eliminate it.

I cannot accept the bill.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, I am unable to understand the reasoning of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) on this particular bill. On the one hand, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) says it is a very grave problem; all the bill is designed to do is to try to meet that problem and try to lay some responsibility for prevention.

The very fact the mines have its equipment, when you get into a small foundry or a number of other processes that we are developing today, with rock dust and silicosis of some kind which would result, it seems to me that we want to do everything we can, because we are having more and more casualties in the industrial world due to industrial diseases.

Now, the Compensation Board has for sometime accepted the proposition of trying to cope with industrial diseases, and we are all trying to do all we can to improve the health of our people and particularly the people on whom we are depending to keep production going, there are many of these plants, many small foundries who cannot afford to have the X-ray equipment which some of the small mines cannot afford.

It seems to me this would lay the responsibility on the right shoulders to see that any employee, or any employer of employees, where a man is subjected or exposed to such a thing, would be required to see that that man goes at least once a year to a centre where he can get an X-ray and where the thing can be headed off before it goes to the extreme of creating another casualty or another compensation case, to be cared for by the Compensation Board.

I am unable, as I said, Mr. Speaker, to understand why the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is opposed to this, because everything that can be done is not being done. I do not think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) can deny that statement, because there are many small plants where, if this was not an Act and somebody responsible to see that a man is checked up once a year, then we could avert the trouble, but if it is not in the Act, that will not be done because the employer does not feel responsible.

It is true the Compensation Board can and will, where they have the equipment, certainly try to check on their people.

This argument that men themselves will be reluctant to be checked for fear they will discover silicotic conditions and therefore might be subjected to removal from that particular position which they hold and have to find some other employment or leave a large accumulated seniority in a position they

hold, does not "hold water" either so far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, because if there are any men so short-sighted or any employer so short-sighted that they know the man is subjected to this condition and is trying to carry on, then they are only borrowing trouble and spreading the results of the disease to other employees who might be affected.

You say silicotic condition might not spread, but it develops into other conditions, such as tuberculosis, and that does spread and does have an effect on other workmen with whom they might be associated.

Therefore, it seems to me this deals with fundamentals: First of all, trying to prevent, by periodic examination and checking, making it a responsibility on the part of the Board and the employer to see that his men do receive the benefit of at least a chest X-ray once a year.

With respect to that part of the bill, I cannot see how the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) can very well say: "Well everything is being done that can be done, therefore we do not want to accept the bill."

It is not going to cost anything, because the Compensation Board will see the employers generally take care of this cost, and it is in the interests of the employer as well as the employee and the public that this should be taken care of.

It is going to create a situation, if we go into that, where we are going to save other costs, mothers' allowance costs, and that of people left without bread-winners because of the early death of the employee, caused in the first analysis because the disease was not discovered and checked quickly enough.

What we are asking for is a periodic and early examination, that if the employer has not the equipment or the equipment is in Bowmanville, Trenton, or some place other than where the man is employed, then he shall be sent to a centre where he can have the advantages of this examination.

At the same time, I might say, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) is already recommending that we take periodic check-ups for tuberculosis, therefore this would serve a dual purpose.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Millard) meant to imply the employers were not interested in this thing because they really are. We have, at least, I have employed within the last two years two inspectors, specialists in foundry work, whom I have assigned to do nothing but foundry work in endeavouring to get better conditions in those foundries.

Employers are spending and industry in general in that particular type of industry, are spending huge sums of money correcting conditions as far as it is mechanically and physically possible to do so.

To make it compulsory for everyone to be X-rayed, brings up the point there are a great many, as you know, older types of men in foundry work; it is not a job which encourages young men to join it, especially when there is other work available. The net result, there are a lot of men who, while they are not extremely old, are not young. These men are fearful, in conversation with me, many of them have expressed that fear, that if they were to be X-rayed there would, because of their long period of time in foundry work, be found some silica dust. They are not ill. There is nothing at the moment appears to be wrong with them, and they would prefer to go on working and finish out their normal period—

MR. JOLLIFFE: And commit suicide.

MR. DALEY: They are not committing suicide, they feel no ill effects from it, and a certain amount of it can be in the human body and not be felt. But, to say to a man say 65 or 68, whose normal life might last another 8 or 10 years, who is not ill, feels

quite well, that because an X-ray discloses he has a little bit of silica in his lungs—

MR. G. I. HARVEY (CCF Nipissing): Mr. Speaker—

MR. DALEY: —in his lungs, that he must leave his job and probably go on old age pension or something, now that is what a great many of the older men are thinking; I do not suppose there would be any active opposition to having an X-ray, but they prefer that we go along in the way we are doing, by inspection and endeavouring—

MR. HARVEY: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) permit a question?

MR. DALEY: —to keep down the cost. Oh, O.K.

MR. HARVEY: Would you estimate how many employees would refuse to have an X-ray on that account? Have you any estimate at all?

MR. DALEY: How many employees?

MR. HARVEY: Yes.

MR. DALEY: Oh, I would not want to make a guess on that. How could I tell?

MR. HARVEY: 2 per cent? 3 per cent?

MR. DALEY: I have no idea.

MR. HARVEY: You have no idea, but you are willing to allow a minority to prevent this going in—

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): We will settle for 51 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is more than you got on the vote.

MR. HARVEY: You want to penalize the majority.

MR. DALEY: I am sure I am at a loss to know where this young hon. member (Mr. Isley) dug this bill up, what prompted this one man whom he mentions, because I, in my position, am not getting pressed for anything like this, and surely I would be, if there was—

AN. HON MEMBER: They have given up hope.

MR. DALEY: Oh, no, they have not, but you fellows can go and dig up the "blamedest" things to make into bills.

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word on this. I think the question of cost to the employer was brought into the discussion. Perhaps I could come within that category myself.

I think I have paid into the Compensation Board a couple of hundred thousand dollars during the last 20 years, so I, perhaps, belong to that class.

However, insofar as this bill is concerned, I am in sympathy with my hon. friend on the right (Mr. Isley).

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Hear, hear.

MR. COX: I have had considerable association with miners, not quite as much, perhaps, as I have had with lumbermen, but a good deal of association with miners. I might say it is very apparent, very obvious, that being brought into contact with many miners, it is easy to distinguish a man who has spent 10 or 15 years in the mines from those who live out of doors, as easy as it is to distinguish a black man from a white man.

I have on many occasions had men come to me for employment, men who had spent many years in the mine and who were unable to carry along their duties in the mine as a result of some disability obviously caused by this matter we are discussing.

They had been affected, so much so, that they could not continue to work and they have thought in many cases, in instances I have encountered, that perhaps a year or six months in the woods, out in the fresh air, would cure them. It has helped some, but in the majority of cases, it has not.

I think this would be a humanitarian thing to do. I can assure hon. members from practical observation and practical experience that there are many, many men in the north who have spent years in the mines and who are affected in some way and greatly disabled today, and thereby prevented from carrying on their logical work.

Therefore, a measure of this kind would do a great deal to facilitate and perhaps would restore to health many of those who are incapacitated today. I am, therefore, entirely in sympathy with my hon. friend's (Mr. Isley) proposal, and I speak from years of experience, being associated with miners as well as lumbermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to understand my hon. friend (Mr. Cox). In what way would this bill help those fellows? You do not disagree with me, do you, when I say that in the mines this very scheme is being followed out and has been for years?

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is a very strong argument for it.

MR. DALEY: They are spending large sums of money in mining, to eliminate it.

MR. COX: I am speaking on the broad principle of people who have been incapacitated in this way, and are perhaps no longer associated with mining and who might obtain relief through a measure such as this.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the government in all seriousness—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER: Always serious.

MR. SALSBERG: It is unfair to put the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) in this position they have put him in tonight. Obviously—

MR. DALEY: Do not feel bad for me.

MR. SALSBERG: Obviously on Cabinet decision, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is objecting to this bill at this late hour in a manner which will make fantastic reading material tomorrow morning, I suggest to you.

I have listened very carefully to the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) argument; he is trying to argue against a bill that it is impossible to argue against.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He does not mean it.

MR. SALSBERG: Of course the hon. minister's (Mr. Daley) heart is not in it, because it is after 2.30—

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): 2.30 does not make any difference.

MR. SALSBERG: His position will just read like—

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): A nightmare.

MR. SALSBERG: No—outlandish, fantastic—tomorrow.

I am sure the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) sitting there feels this is an argument against everything he argues for, and there is no defence for it. I mean it—that it is unfair to have the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) argue against this bill. Now, either the government agrees to let it stand over and give itself a chance to study it again before it finally rejects it, or it votes for the bill. It is in complete accord with everything the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has said in numerous places, in public speeches and statements.

MR. FROST: No.

MR. SALSBERG: And it has been advocated by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley), and it is something that is being advocated by every

public health body in this province, and elsewhere.

All the bill strives to do is to make it law, and obligatory to carry out the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley). That is all it is, to make it compulsory. To argue that a man of sixty will be afraid to have himself X-rayed because the X-ray might disclose the beginning of silicosis, and, therefore, he might lose his job, is to argue—I do not want to use the term that would apply to it, but it is just not the thing to do.

I know it is late, but I am quite serious in suggesting to the government that they agree to let the bill stand over for further consideration, before disposing of it.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I I must say that I share the view expressed by the hon. Member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), which I think probably expresses the views of other hon. members on this side of the House, that in view of the very unsatisfactory statement made by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), we should not hurry through this bill, but rather to let it stand over, and give the hon. members of the government, and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) an opportunity to consider it.

The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) argues that the very thing this bill proposes is being followed now by employers in certain sections of industry.

As the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) suggested a moment ago, surely that is a very strong argument why this practice should be established in law and placed on the statute books of the province, and I have enough confidence in the good judgment of the hon. members of the government to believe if they will give this matter a little further thought, and let the bill stand over for a day or two, they may arrive at a conclusion different from that expressed by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) tonight.

I agree one hundred per cent. with my colleague (Mr. Salsberg) when he said a moment ago that the rejection of this bill is a complete negation of everything the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) has been advocating, as head of his department, for the last two or three years. I do not think he wants to be placed in that position. Furthermore, I do not think he would want to be embarrassed by having his position as stated tonight appear in the records of this Legislature as the last answer of this government with respect to this very sensible bill presented by the hon. member.

MR. DALEY: I say we are attacking this problem, and have been for several years, working in conjunction with industry, and in discussions with many people who work in industry, who might be subject to this. To say that our efforts are—I do not think that they are fruitless; in fact, I think we are doing a very good job on it. As I pointed out, we have two special men who are dealing with the officers—

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, on that point, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) what he is doing with plants like this Gypsum plant in Weston? What does he know about the results? The Department has sent men into the factories and into the mines, but what does the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) say about the other industries? He is not taking care of them.

MR. DALEY: We are following a policy of education and endeavouring to eliminate the cause of these, and I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that our efforts are worthwhile, and that we are accomplishing much. I am prepared to go along with what I have already said.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (CCF Hamilton East): I do not know whether I understood the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) correctly. I have worked in foundries, and have negotiated union contracts with some of the largest foundries in the province of Ontario, both representing the employers and the Union, and I have never heard of an inspector coming in and questioning the employers about silicosis.

MR. DALEY: I must tell my inspectors to look you up.

MR. DOWLING: Why not have the inspectors come and meet the representatives of the employers in their union offices? I never heard of them, and I have worked in the foundry industry.

The other thing I wanted to say was that I note—and to a certain extent understand—the apprehension of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) about what it is going to cost to have certain silicosis tests made. I can well understand his apprehension, because it will take away a little bit of extra profits from the amount being poured into the political "pork barrel"—

MR. FROST: If my friend wants to get in the gutter—I say he is pretty low.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: You are just as low as it is possible to be, and you ought to be ashamed of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DOWLING: I made a statement—

MR. DUNBAR: Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROST: That type of thing will not go.

MR. SPEAKER: We have conducted the debate on a very fine level today. I will not tolerate, even at this hour, any repetition of what occurred yesterday. I think every hon. member is subjected to some cross-fire, and I will certainly allow the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Dowling) to carry on, if he will keep the debate on the same level at which he started it.

MR. DOWLING: If you want to know what I am talking about, it is in the records at Ottawa. I think if the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is sincere in this thing, on the basis of having inspectors go around the foundries, they can come to Hamilton, to the International Harvester Company, one of the largest malleable and grey iron foundries in that area, and I would be only too pleased to have the employees in that foundry meet the inspector. I would suggest he communicate with the union committee, and meet with the industrial manager in that plant, because there is certainly in at least two parts of that plant, corrections necessary to be made. I do not think any of the employees will refuse to be X-rayed.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, if it be the will of this government that they shall support only those bills which are presented by them, and refuse to support any bills which are presented by the Opposition, then there is very little I can say.

It seems to me as though this bill is one of the least contentious bills that could be presented to this House. It seems to me it is an answer to some of the problems which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) says he has. I cannot definitely see one objection whatsoever to the hon. members of this House, irrespective of their political views, accepting this unanimously.

MR. DUNBAR: I would like to say I have a lot of respect for the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Brown). I say to him that we sat in this House for seven years, and there was never a bill presented by the Opposition even called.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On the same vote, Mr. Minister (Mr. Frost)?

MR. FROST: Yes.

Motion negatived.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 72.

MR. NIXON: Are we going on this way all night?

MR. FROST: This is the last bill.

MR. OLIVER: After all, there is reason in everything.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 72nd Order; second reading of Bill No. 139, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," Mr. Fell.

MR. L. F. K. FELL (CCF Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 139, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act."

Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say this evening—or I might say "last night" or "this morning"—we have seen a few other bills relative to the Workmen's Compensation Act go down to defeat. The majority of the previous bills dealing with Workmen's Compensation have been in line providing for added assistance to some cases where compensation is in most cases already being supplied. This bill which is before the House at this time, deals with cases where compensation in some part is required, where none is being paid at the present time.

As I pointed out in the first reading of this bill, Mr. Speaker, it is intended to provide compensation where a pre-existing condition is aggravated.

Sub-section 1 of Section 1 means in effect that where a workman who is already affected by a pre-existing condition, but is able to fulfil his normal duties of work, meets with an accident while working is thus rendered unable to continue his work because of such accident, he shall be compensated. I have reference to many examples of such a situation of which I, with your permission, choose to mention at this time.

There is a case of where a man of 49 years of age has been employed by a firm continuously for many years to fulfil a type of work which has been comparatively easy for him to do. This man in the normal course of his duties, a short time ago, had the experience of unknowingly causing a strain on his heart. The extent of injury was not noted until two or three days later, at which time the man became entirely unable to either work or take care of himself in a normal fashion. The situation was reported to the Workmen's Compensation Board, who made the usual medical examination and also ordered that a cardiagram (which is a method of photographing the heart) be taken, this indicated that the applicant had a pre-existing heart condition to which he had no knowledge himself, but due to this extra amount of strain being placed upon the heart, proved sufficient to aggravate his condition to the extent that I have already mentioned. On the basis of the examination made by the Workmen's Compensation Board of examiners, and in line with their recommendation, this man's application for compensation was turned down.

His present circumstances are these. One, he is unable to work. Two, he is not entitled to compensation. Three, he has no recourse to an accident or sick benefit plan, and in short has no financial income whatsoever, short of a temporary assistance from the municipal welfare board.

There are many other such cases as this, which in some cases come under the heading of arthritis. The circumstances are very similar, and in effect mean that these people have no protection whatever under the present regulations governing workmen's compensation in this province. It seems to me that this is a most deplorable and certainly unfortunate circumstance, which has been allowed to exist in spite of the broad privileges accorded the commission under the Act. I note, with grave concern, that the above mentioned cases are, as closely as I can discover, probably the only types of cases which are not covered in any way whatsoever.

It is unfortunate that we have been able to make at least some advancements in many of the provisions of the present Act, but seem to have completely disregarded such serious problems as I have outlined.

I offer, by way of alleviation, the suggestion as put forward in subsection 2 of Section 1 of this bill, which means in effect that the board, in considering

the above cases should estimate to what degree of disability the applicant has been subject as a result directly of the accident, and should pay to that extent the appropriate amount of compensation already provided for under the Act, and that the remainder of compensation due to that portion of disability, which might be termed pre-existent, should be paid from the special FUND provided for in Subsection 2 of Section 101, which says:

> "The board where it deems proper, may add to the assessment for any class or classes or for all the classes in Schedule 1, a percentage or sum for the purpose of raising a special fund, to be laid aside and used to meet the loss arising from any disaster or other circumstance which in the opinion of the board, would unfairly burden the employers in any class."

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the present Act makes adequate provision for the payment of compensation to those cases where the disability is due to the aggravation of a pre-existing condition, and trust that this Assembly will authorize the implementation of the necessary authority to take the action suggested in this bill.

Before I go on, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this. I sat here all afternoon and all last night and this morning, and I have listened to speakers on the other side of the House, and I have refrained from interrupting any hon. member when he was speaking, and I would appreciate it if I would be accorded the same treatment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a certain latitude shown on both sides of the House. There has been considerable talking on both sides, amongst the hon. members themselves, and has been going on for some time. I have drawn the attention of the hon. members to it before, and I think it is about time we eliminate some of the unnecessary talking between ourselves. It is only natural that the hon. members will have to put up with a certain amount of chatter which takes place in this Chamber. Perhaps I should say that the hon. members near the bottom there (indicating) are doing less talking than anybody else. I suppose the chatter is one thing we will have to accept.

AN HON. MEMBER: In the government.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, may I just draw your attention to this, on a point of order: after all, we are showing the hon. member (Mr. Fell) courtesy and consideration. He is not allowed to read a speech in the Legislature.

AN HON. MEMBER: You read yours.

MR. BLACKWELL: We let him go ahead and read. I do not know whether it matters if we listened or not.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): May I ask if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) was present when my good friend the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) was presenting that gigantic manuscript earlier this evening?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Public Works): It was a report.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I did not object.

MR. DOUCETT: That is a different matter.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): I may say that it is quite in order for an hon. minister to read a document.

MR. W. B. HARVEY (CCF Nipissing): Copious notes.

THE SPEAKER: On the point of order, a report may certainly be read, there is no question of that. An hon. member may not read a speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: It cuts both ways.

MR. FROST: We have no objection. Go ahead.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you over-ruling "the boss?"

MR. SPEAKER: If you wish to go ahead, carry on by all means, please.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On a point of order; I have not the slightest objection to what the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) did tonight, and I may say he got a very quiet hearing. However, this fine distinction between the reading of a report to the House or to the Committee of Supply, and the making of a speech is just ridiculous.

MR. BLACKWELL: It is a very important distinction, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) well knows.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the hon. member (Mr. Fell) proceed?

MR. FELL: Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, may I say I thank the government benches for their courtesy, up to tonight, anyway. I can appreciate the difficulties they are labouring under.

I have appreciated, and so have other "back-benchers" from this party, the consideration many hon. members have given us because we know once they sat here and know what it is like to get up and do this sort of thing for the first time. We know many of them appreciate some of the difficulties we have had in trying to uphold our end of it.

Up to now, I have been treated most fairly, and I would have liked to go on with my speech without reading it, but with all the interruptions coming, I was anxious to get the whole thing over—

MR. BLACKWELL: So were we.

MR. FELL: —and sit down, because I could see no one was interested.

Mr. Speaker, I want it on record that we certainly do appreciate, as "back-benchers" and new hon. members of the Legislature, the treatment we have been receiving from some of the hon. members. I think there were many times when some of them could possibly have affected us, and they have not taken advantage of it. I think if they continue in that way, they will certainly at least enjoy the respect which many of us have for many hon. members over there, and will continue to have in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not read that, either.

MR. FELL: No, I did not read that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FELL: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my point clear, that this bill does provide protection for those who are not now covered under The Compensation Act, that is, people who have had a condition of which they may not be aware and yet, during the normal course of their work, may come into circumstances where, by an extra effort on their part, may completely disable them and make them unable to work for the rest of their lives, as in the case of the 49-year-old man whose case was cited.

I think this government does have this authority under the existing rules. As I pointed out, Section 101 of the present Act provides proper authority for the funds necessary under the special sub-section in the Act to bring this situation to a conclusion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, of course the hon. member (Mr. Fell) is aware that workmen's compensation is a charge against industry, to compensate people who are injured in industry. It is not a social service which covers everything that might unfortunately happen to different people.

I submit to you, sir that there would

be no way of carrying out this bill were it passed by this House, because there is no way to estimate to what extent a man's condition before he was injured was affected by his injury. I think the only thing we can do is what we are doing at the present time, at least, what the Board is doing; it is being generous and considering the disability of the injured person and trying to estimate to what extent they can compensate him and still remain under the regulations of the Act.

Compensation is not that broad. Industry cannot be expected to pay for things that happen to people that have no connection at all with their work in industry.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I advise you, we do not approve of this bill.

MR. C. W. COX (L Fort William): Mr. Speaker, this time, will have to agree with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and to disagree with my hon. friend (Mr. Fell). He might be able to explain this, but it is beyond my comprehension, to see through this bill. It is entirely too wide, it covers too much territory, gives too much latitude.

It seems to me that if this were enacted, the Board would be spending its time in utter confusion, for lack of interpretation. Compensation is based on accidents, not on injuries. It would look to me as if a man might have sciatica or might have neuralgia, and ten years later could perhaps attribute an accident to the neuralgia or sciatica.

I do not want to be too critical, but I do suggest it is ambiguous and would lead to endless confusion.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): It is a matter of medical evidence.

MR. J. G. BROWN (L Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox). It seems to me the Workmen's Compensation Board, under its examiners, does have the authority of exercising a certain degree of latitude in cases such as this.

I have heard, for instance, of pre-existing conditions for such troubles as hernia where, in many cases, it has become necessary for the employee to lay off work. I do know that during the last two or three years, the Workmen's Compensation Board has given consideration to such items as that, and I believe with the latitude the Workmen's Compensation Board has in connection with cases such as this, the situation is very well looked after.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): We thought you were not well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to remind the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that, when he says this is a charge on industry, I would like him to consider also that this department of government has saved that industry millions of dollars in this province, that if we did not have workmen's compensation in this province, industry would have to pay three or four times the rate for accident insurance if they had to buy it from the existing insurance companies, our private companies.

Just to give you an example, sir, when the recent bridge was painted across the Niagara River, right in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) constituency, I understand the workmen on the Canadian side were covered by the Workmen's Compensation Board, and the company only paid $5.40 per $100 worth of wages. On the American side, where they had to buy the same insurance from a private company, they had to pay something like $45 per $100 worth of labour. That is an example of what this has saved industry. It has saved industry millions of dollars in the province.

MR. DUNBAR: That is what the Tory government did for you.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Minister of

Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), you may not admit it, but this Act was actually put into operation by the farmer-labour government in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): No, no, no.

MR. DENNISON: It is true there was something on the statute books—

MR. SPEAKER: Let us stick to the bill.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, there is one case in my constituency which I think this bill will help, and I hope hon. members of the Liberal Party will support me on this.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): What a hope.

MR. DENNISON: A very fine gentleman in my constituency, who worked for the Board of Education for years, fell downstairs and injured his back.

MR. BLACKWELL: What did you expect him to do—fall upstairs?

MR. DENNISON: He was paid compensation—this is no laughing matter.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (CCF Hamilton East): You have to laugh at people being injured.

MR. DENNISON: He was in the hospital for months, and returned to his work and still was not able to continue his work.

A short time afterwards, he got arthritis in his back, in the place in which he was injured, and because that was not one of the injuries for which he could draw assistance, he received no assistance since from the Workmen's Compensation Board.

That man has exhausted his whole life's savings, and his sons have exhausted a large share of theirs. He has not been a charge on the City of Toronto or the Workmen's Compensation Board because he could not get it from the board.

I think a bill like this will help that kind of case. We know sometimes an accident is caused by some previous condition, or the suffering of the individual is greatly enlarged by some previous condition, and in this case, I know this bill would have been a godsend to that working man.

MR. FELL: Mr. Speaker, I understand I am allowed to speak again—

MR. SPEAKER: You spoke on the bill.

MR. HARVEY: He introduced the bill.

MR. DOWLING: He introduced the bill; does he not have a right to close it?

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no one to reply to it, except—

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell)?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do you want to speak again?

MR. FELL: I would like to say, this, Mr. Speaker, I can pretty well predict what is going to happen to the bill. It is obviously going to be defeated. I recognized that fact when I came in here tonight. However, I do say this, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to continue—it is quite all right to laugh about it, Mr Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley)—

MR. DALEY: I am not laughing about it.

MR. FELL: It is all right to laugh about it, but people's lives are what is concerned. These are important things, maybe not to you or I or hon. members over here, who have referred to the tremendous cost it is going to be on industry. I do not think it would be that much cost, and I am quite sure in this case where the people are getting absolutely no help whatever, management

would perhaps be even more interested in having it, because, after all, who is going to take care of those people?

If you are going to turn down bills like this, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and the government should be prepared to offer reasonable alternatives, if they are going to continue to turn down bills that make reasonable recommendations.

You cannot turn down people like this, and say: "We do not care what condition you are in, we are not going to give it to you." Tell me, what are those people going to think; what kind of letter can I write to those people tomorrow morning, after the bill has been defeated? I can tell you what I will have to put in print. I do not think it is fair that we take such a bloodthirsty attitude on this occasion. That is what it means. Have your laugh and have your day, but I think the people of Ontario should know these facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Fell) introduced the bill, and he has closed the debate.

MR. HARVEY: But—

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. I allowed the hon. member (Mr. Fell) to speak twice on the bill.

MR. HARVEY: I want to make a correction of a misinterpretation by the hon. minister (Mr. Daley).

MR. SPEAKER: You may ask a question, that is all I can allow you to do, I am sorry.

MR. HARVEY: Did I understand the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to say compensation is for injury—injury to the person?

MR. DALEY: Yes, sure.

MR. HARVEY: You said that? Are you not misinterpreting the Workmen's Compensation Act? It is compensation for loss of earnings, not for injury, but loss of earnings, and for that reason, if anybody is—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. FROST: Do not split hairs, boys.

MR. HARVEY: —if anybody is met with a condition that, through some accident, might aggravate that condition—

MR. FROST: This is not—

MR. HARVEY: I am trying to point out it is not for injury to a person, it is for loss of earnings.

MR. SPEAKER: I must rule that I allowed the hon. member (Mr. Fell) who introduced the bill to conclude the Debate at his own request. Therefore, I do not feel the hon member (Mr. Harvey) can carry on.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Permit me to say I agree with your ruling, but I do point out at the same time that no objection was taken from this side when, in one debate tonight, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) spoke—I counted them—at least 10 times.

MR. FROST: You asked him questions. We would never do that.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) was answering questions.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He made 10 speeches, one after another.

Motion negatived.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn and, when it adjourns, it stand adjourned until 1.30 o'clock this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): In making that motion, will the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) also tell us

what he has in mind between 1.30 and, will it be 3.30 or 11.30 tomorrow?

MR. FROST: We close at 3.30 tomorrow.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Today, you mean.

MR. FROST: Yes, today.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But, what have you in mind for the programme between 1.30 and 3.30?

MR. FROST: Bills and Estimates.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Which Estimates?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Government bills?

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Could we skip this afternoon?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) what he means by "Bills;" would that be government bills and Estimates?

MR. FROST: That is right.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2.59 a.m.

Vol. III, No. 32

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Friday, March 25, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 25, 1949

Charitable and Other Gifts, bill respecting, Mr. Frost, first reading..... 1335
Liquor Licence Act, 1946, bill to amend, Mr. Millard, first reading..... 1339
The Securities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, first reading..... 1339
The Statute Law Amendment Act, introduced by Mr. Blackwell, first reading..... 1339
Alcoholic Research Foundation, bill to provide, Mr. Kelley, first reading..... 1339
Crown Timber Act, introduced by Mr. Scott, first reading..... 1341
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Doucett, first reading..... 1341
Oleomargarine, bill respecting, Mr. Goodfellow, bill held over..... 1343
Public Lands Act, bill to amend, Mr. Scott, bill held over..... 1344
Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Scott, bill stands..... 1344
Forest Management Act, 1947, bill to amend, Mr. Scott (Peterborough), third reading 1345
Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1948, bill to amend, Mr. Scott (Peterborough), third reading 1345
Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949, bill respecting, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1345
Power Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Challies, third reading..... 1345
Companies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1345
Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1346
College of Art Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1346
Continuation Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1346
High Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1346
Public Libraries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1346
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1347
Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1347
Change of Name Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, third reading..... 1347
Consolidation of Regulations, bill to provide, Mr. Blackwell, third reading..... 1347
Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, third reading..... 1347
Companies Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, third reading..... 1347
Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, third reading..... 1348
Teachers' Board of Reference Act, 1946, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1348
Schools Sites Act, bill to amend, Mr. Porter, third reading..... 1348
City of Peterborough, bill respecting, Mr. Stewart, third reading..... 1348
Cornwall Street Railway, Light and Power Company Limited, bill respecting, Mr. McDonald, third reading..... 1348
Village of Wasaga Beach, bill to incorporate, Mr. Johnston (Simcoe Centre), third reading 1349
Canada Comforter Company Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, third reading..... 1349
City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Patrick, third reading..... 1349
Township of Etobicoke, bill respecting, Mr. Millard, third reading..... 1349
Sarnia Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A., bill respecting, Mr. Cathcart, third reading..... 1349
Canadian National Exhibition Association, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, third reading..... 1350
Township of Kingston, bill respecting, Mr. Pringle, third reading..... 1350
Town of Tecumseh, bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, third reading..... 1350
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Chartrand, third reading..... 1350
Fire Departments Act, 1949, bill respecting, Mr. Blackwell, third reading..... 1350
Police Act, 1948, bill respecting, Mr. Blackwell, third reading..... 1351
Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, third reading..... 1352
The Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, third reading..... 1352
Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, third reading..... 1352
The Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, third reading..... 1353
The Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, third reading..... 1353
Local Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dunbar, third reading..... 1353
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Whole, Mr. Frost, agreed to..... 1353
The Township of East York, bill respecting, Miss Macphail, bill reported..... 1353
The City of Owen Sound, bill respecting, Mr. Phillips, bill reported..... 1353
Township of Sandwich West, bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, bill reported..... 1354
The City of St. Catharines, bill respecting, Mr. Martin, bill reported..... 1354
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to..... 1354
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to..... 1360

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

FRIDAY, MARCH 25, 1948.

1.30 o'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 1.30 o'clock.

Prayers.

Our God and Father, who in Thy mercy has placed us in this dominion, we return thanks to Thee for the added opportunity afforded by bringing the ancient colony of Newfoundland within our land. For all the tradition, for all the history, and for all the contributions of these our fellow citizens we return our gratitude. Grant that united in service for one another, in mutual welfare for all and in justice and devotion to Thee, we, Thy children, may go forward in the preservation of peace, in the love of one another, and in the extension of Thy kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

The Lord's Prayer.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CHARITABLE AND OTHER GIFTS

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Blackwell, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act respecting certain charitable and other gifts," and that same may now be read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister please explain.

MR. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): May we have an explanation?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): May we have a word from the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost)?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this Act which I have just introduced is an Act which I think deserves a more complete explanation than is ordinarily given on the first reading of any bill. The Act touches a very important subject, and I think perhaps we may be, in this province, one of the first jurisdictions to deal with a subject which is becoming of far-reaching importance in our society.

This Act is very important from the standpoint of public interest and it is desirable at this time that an outline of what is intended should be given. The following points are involved:

1. It is in the public interest that moneys and assets should be given to charities. It is desirable that every encouragement should be given to the person who desires to give his estate or any portion thereof for such purposes. The provisions of the Ontario Succession Duty Act have been from time to time widened to relieve from the payment of duties such gifts.

My hon. friends know that in the recent budget, very much wider exemptions were given in relation to gifts to religious organizations, and that has been the policy which has been followed

now for some six years, and our gift provisions have been very much widened.

2. When such gifts have been made it is necessary and desirable that there should be some safeguards to assure that the charitable intent is carried out.

3. By relieving such trusts or bequests from succession duties the province becomes to that extent interested in the trust owing to the fact that the exemption is in fact a gift from the public to the trust.

I may explain it this way; when, under our Act, an estate is exempt from the payment of succession duties because of the charitable intent and purpose of trusts which have been created in the will, then the taxpayers of Ontario, as it were, become shareholders in the trust, to the amounts of the succession duties which have been waived, and the exemption of which has been allowed to the estate. I think it is well to bear that in mind. I may say the largest contributor to charitable and religious organizations in Ontario is the government and the people of this province. I think it is well, also to bear that in mind. No charity, when it is created, and receives the benefits and bequests and gifts from the taxpayers of Ontario, is then limited to this alone, because, after all, the taxpayers are interested in it. The question of public duty for each and every one of us arises.

Having the above in mind, it is the intention of the government, by means of regulations under The Charities Accounting Act, to provide that all charitable trusts and foundations shall file with the proper officer financial statements relating to the operations of such trusts so that the public which is interested through its contributions by way of sucession duty exemptions and the charities which are interested as beneficiaries under the trusts, shall have the fullest information as to what is taking place. This object, however, is in addition to the purposes of this particular bill which deals with another aspect of the problem which, under present conditions, has become more apparent.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friends who read *Time* a week or two ago and who are interested in this kind of a situation, will be interested in the situation which exists in the State of New Hampshire with regard to it. I note the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) nodding his head, and no doubt he has seen it, I think it has reached very alarming proportions in that state.

It has become the custom in setting up charitable trusts and foundations, either by way of letters patent or by a trust instrument such as a deed or will, to empower the trustees to devote the income to charitable purposes the choice of which is left in the discretion of the trustees. The idea is that the testator or the creator of the trust delegates to his trustees a discretion to determine from time to time in the light of changing conditions to what charities the income or indeed the principal of the trust may be devoted. Subject to the regulations which are contemplated under The Charities Accounting Act there can be no objection to this procedure.

That is the condition which is created by most of these trusts which have been created by reason of letters patent, and trusts which have been created by will.

The principal problem arises where a business either in its entirety or a controlling interest therein is given to a charitable foundation or trust.

My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Oliver) can apply this to the New Hampshire situation, which he read in *Time*.

The trustees who may, under the trust or foundation, either receive no remuneration or remuneration which is subject to review by the courts.

Mr. Speaker, most of these charitable foundations are created on these bases, that the trustees are appointed; they can name their own successors in perpetuity. In many of these, the trustees will receive no remuneration for acting as trustees for the foundation itself.

The trustees may appoint themselves

as directors, managers or officers of such business and may themselves and by their successors whom they have the right to appoint, control and operate such business in perpetuity.

That may sound very sweeping, but that is a fact. The business may be operated under that system by these trustees and their successors whom they appoint.

One of the effects of succession duties is constantly to break up economic concentration of wealth and force distribution and sale, with the result that the assets of estates are constantly changing hands. This is necessary and desirable in an economy such as ours. Quite obviously, however, this result is not reached under the wide exemptions from succession duties which are granted under succession duty acts to assets devoted to charitable purposes. It is now apparent from the trend which has manifested itself in the last four or five years that businesses may be actually operated by such charitable trusts and foundations in perpetuity.

This presents the following problems:

1. The trustees and their successors are in effect given the right to appoint themselves and their successors as directors, managers and officers of such businesses for all time. It quite naturally follows that relatives connected with either the testator, founder or the trustees would be the logical successors.

2. Owing to the fact that, generally, no specific charities are named, it follows that the trustees may operate these trusts according to their own ideas and they may or may not be interested in operating such businesses for any profit other than their own salaries and fees. In other words, the charitable object may become secondary to the interest of the directors, managers and officers who would be by themselves and their successors the trustees in perpetuity.

3. In the result, the huge exemptions which are given under The Succession Duty Act from taxation are not effectively devoted to any charities. The charitable intent becomes secondary.

4. From an economic point of view, such a result would, without regulation, no doubt become a menace to competitive business and provide extremely unfair competition to businesses which are endeavoring to pay taxes and provide dividends for shareholders. Compare for instance two similar types of business, one which is publicly financed, the shares of which are owned by the public, and another, owned and controlled by a trust or foundation, the charitable objects of which are indefinite as above mentioned. In the first case, the business has to be operated to provide dividends for the shareholders. In earning dividends for the shareholders it must pay taxes to both the province and the dominion. In the case of Ontario, this year it is estimated that such companies will pay the province $58,500,000, in addition to providing funds for payment of dividends to shareholders and expansion. In the second case, as stated, the business is operated by a charitable trust. It has been relieved of succession duty. Very large sums of public money indeed are invested in the foundation by means of the exemptions referred to. The trustees are under no obligation to pay dividends. They may provide goods and services at such prices as to constitute unfair competition to the detriment of other businesses which are carying on and endeavouring to pay the claims which the public impose by way of taxation.

I would like to make that point a little more clear to the hon. members of the House.

In the first place, the public company is earning dividends and paying taxes. In the second case, there is not the incentive to make profit, and they can unfairly compete with companies endeavouring to pay dividends, pay their taxes and carry on in a competitive industry.

This brings us down to the purposes of this bill. The best scrutiny that can be provided for the proper operation of any company or business is that given by the shareholders who are interested in it. No government or public officer

could possibly undertake to exercise the discretions which would be involved in passing upon the operations of various businesses. It therefore follows in the case of any charitable trust or foundation either—

1. That it should, within a reasonable time, dispose of its interest in any business which has been given to it and invest the proceeds in funds which are authorized by law, or

2. Turn over its interest in such business to established charitable organizations, in which case such organizations would constantly exercise the proper security of the operations of the business because of their interest in its profits.

Let me give you this example; supposing an interest in a business is left to the Queen Mary Sanitorium. Naturally the directors of that Sanitorium will be interested in that business to the extent that they will want dividends and profits to carry on the operations of that hospital. Therefore, they provide the necessary scrutiny to see that the business is conducted actually on the best basis.

The Charitable Gifts Act of 1949 provides:

1. That if a charitable trust or foundation holds more than ten per centum of the interest in any business it must dispose of the excess above ten per centum. In other words, no charitable trust or foundation may hereafter own more than ten per centum of the capital stock of any company.

2. If the charitable trust or foundation converts into cash such excess over ten per centum, then it may invest the proceeds in investments authorized by law subject to this, that it may invest in no company to the extent of more than ten per centum of that company's capital stock.

3. It follows that if the charitable foundation does not desire actually to sell on the market the excess shares, it may, by outright gift, vest the same in specific charities, but no charity may hold more than ten per centum of such capital stock.

In other words, let me give an example; supposing a foundation controls 100 per cent. of the shares of a company; it may retain ten per cent., and it may give ten per cent. of the shares to specific charities. Each of the charities then becomes a shareholder in the concern, and they provide the scrutiny which we think is essential in the proper operation of that business.

It follows from the bill that a charitable foundation in distributing the capital stock which it holds, among certain charities, cannot retain an interest in the same. The gift must be outright. The effect of the above is to prevent the undersirable concentration of the control of business in perpetuity in charitable trusts or foundations.

It will be noted that under the bill, charitable trusts and foundations are given until the 1st April, 1952, to comply with this law, and while it enforces dispersal it does not necessarily follow that the shares should be thrown upon the market and assets sacrificed by way of forced sale.

The basis of the bill is to assure that assets that are exempted from succession duties on the grounds that they are being devoted to charitable purposes shall in fact be devoted to charitable purposes, and shall not be devoted to purposes in which charity is secondary. It also assures a dispersal of the assets in such a manner as to prevent large businesses being operated in perpetuity by trustees and their successors with the ill effects which have been outlined.

It should be borne in mind also that this bill in no way imposes any additional taxes nor does it attempt to tax charitable foundations. The whole policy of the government is to the contrary. It desires to encourage charitable trusts and foundations, but desires them to be such and not merely charitable trusts and foundations as a cloak for something else.

This bill does not apply to any interest in any business given to or vested in any religious denomination. The purposes of that are quite plain. There are certain of our religious denominations that are the operators

of a charitable trust and foundation and, in some cases, they operate businesses, but the adherence of these churches are not affected. The shareholders in these cases and in the meetings, they scrutinize the operations of these concerns and they control payment of the directorate and avoid the advances of which I have mentioned.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) explain who it is aimed at, if it is not aimed at religious institutions?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Use your imagination.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (CCF Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) a question? Why did you stop at religious organizations? Suppose a charity is set up in a charitable trust, and it designates a certain use. For instance, a hospital, it is going to support a hospital. I would say in that case it should be exempt, the same as religious organizations.

MR. FROST: That matter can be given consideration when the bill comes up for discussion.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LIQUOR LICENCE ACT, 1946

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Isley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Liquor Licence Act, 1946," and that same be now read a first time.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) want to make an explanation?

MR. MILLARD: I am just going to offer to the House the purpose of the amended section. It is to be found in the explanatory note attached to the bill. The Liquor Licence Act, 1946, provides that no stores shall be established and no premises licensed in so-called, "local option areas," until an affirmative vote has been registered as provided in Section 69.

There are many municipalities, however, in which no local option by-law was previously in force, but in which no facilities for the sale of liquor had existed. The purpose of this bill is to provide that no liquor, beer or wine store shall be established in such a municipality unless the people living there vote for it. They are already protected against the establishment of licensed premises by the provisions of Section 23 of the Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SECURITIES ACT

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Securities Act, 1947," and same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1949," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ALCOHOLIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION

HON. RUSSELL T. KELLEY (PC Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Scott, that leave be given to introduce an Act to provide for the Alcoholic Research

Foundation, and that same be now read for a first time.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): He is looking for admission to it already.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Mr. Speaker, when the day arrives that I have to go into any institution like that—

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. TEMPLE: I was going to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Kelley) if this has reference to the alcoholic hospitals which he recently announced would be constructed in the province.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is a small part of it.

MR. KELLEY: Mr. Speaker, possibly I should give some short explanation in connection with this bill. Rightly or wrongly, the people of this province have decided that liquor is to be sold in the Province of Ontario. Experience has shown that certain people are not able to control their appetite for liquor and, therefore, acquire a disease called "alcoholism."

Now, there has been an organization formed in Canada and other parts of the world, known as "Alcoholics Anonymous." In my life it has been my pleasure to be associated with and to know and study many organizations and, outside of the church, I would say that I know of no organization doing a finer work than Alcoholics Anonymous.

I have attended meetings where there have been 1,000—another meeting of 1,500. I have attended a meeting in Rochester and also in Buffalo, and I can truthfully say I never saw more love and consideration and interest in one another's fellow men and women too, than is shown by the members of this Association.

Now, it is proposed to establish a commission composed of seven, and these will not be entirely members of Alcoholics Anonymous. At the present time, three or four of them will be business people of the province, and some will be members of Alcoholics Anonymous. They will join, not as members of Alcoholics Anonymous but as individual citizens. We are going to contribute $100,000 towards this work. One of the first works it has to do will be to establish a hospital. Some may say, and it has been done in one or two of the states in the United States, where they have—in Buffalo they have 50 rooms in one hospital for the use of these people, and in Rochester there is, in one hospital, 20 rooms. For the last 2 or 3 years, we have decided the better way would be to have a hospital which would accommodate 25 to 30 people, and these alcoholics would be sent there and their cases studied.

There may be one criticism regarding the amount contributed. We have had many, many conferences with the members of the organization known as Alcoholics Anonymous, and this is the amount which we feel is sufficient, at least, at the present time. I am hopeful that this undertaking will prove successful. I know from what I have gathered it will have the endorsement of the people of this province, and I believe we can do much to help those who, unfortunately, are not able to control their appetite for liquor. As I said before, I believe there is no organization today in the world outside of the church where there is the same love and interest shown in one another. I am hoping that the work of this government, which is another forward step, will have the support of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TEMPLE: May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker? The hon. Minister (Mr. Kelley) stated, "rightly or wrongly, the people had decided in favour of the sale of liquor." I would like to ask when they ever had a chance to decide this on a vote?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is out of order.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CROWN TIMBER ACT

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Kelley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "The Crown Timber Act," and that same be now read a first time.

This sets up a standard measurement of cubic feet for pulp wood cut in different measurements. It also allows the department to grant an extension of cutting rights on other species. Where a licensed owner may have the right to cut spruce, for proper forest management, he should cut the poplar, jack pine and balsam. It also authorizes the department upon salvaged portions. In the case such as the fire we had last year, or a windstorm may go through an area or there may be insect infestation. That is, the timber which belongs to the crown is under license to some operating company. It also simplifies the method of disposing of seized timber. I might say, we have to seize timber for non-payment, or in cases of trespass and the regulations, at the present time, take about two months before this timber may be disposed of. In some cases it has borers in it or rot and this is to hasten that process.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the government is pretty well finished, or is there something yet to come?

MR. BLACKWELL: There is something still to come.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (PC Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Challies, that leave be given to introduce an Act intituled, "An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act."

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a number of amendments to the Highway Traffic Act, just to clarify some of its provisions. It also includes amendments to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund that have been found to be desirable.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table an answer to Quesion 97.

I also beg leave to table a return to the Order of this House dated March 17, 1949. There was read before this House the table showing Hydro-Electric Power Commission peaks for power in the years 1940 to 1948.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I would like to have the opportunity of clearing up a matter that arose in the discussion last night.

AN HON. MEMBER: This morning.

MR. SALSBERG: Some hon. member suggested it was this morning. I do not know when it was really. By now the days and nights seem to be one continuous procession. However, before we adjourned the last session, discussion took place in connection with the Film Censorship Board. I would like to clear up the point that arose in the discussion and I am sure that the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) will welcome it as well as all hon. members of the House.

I want to say that I am certain that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) did not deliberately say anything which would give the House any wrong impression. I think he advised the House on the basis of what he was told by his officials, and I assure you that neither did I attempt to misrepresent facts. *Hansard,* on Page FF-4—

MR. FROST: May I suggest my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) should table the correspondence that he refers to and after the sittings of the House the hon. members can line up to read the correspondence. I am sure they would be interested. However, I think my hon. friend should table the correspondence.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why?

MR. SALSBERG: It would not take

much time and I would prefer to read it to the House rather than table it. In *Hansard,* on Page FF-4, it quotes me as saying:

> "As an illustration, to prove the correctness of my charge and cause for alarm, is the action of the Board in the case of a documentary film produced in the United States and banned in this province by the Motion Picture Board. The documentary is known by the name of 'Native Land.'"

Hansard, on the following page, quotes the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) as saying:

> "I might say, 'Native Land' has never been submitted to the censor board."

On FF-6, the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is quoted as saying:

> "It has never been sent up."

As I said before, I am certain that the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) did not deliberately make this statement that perhaps did not jibe with fact, but here are the facts. I have in my hand a letter, dated October 25, 1948, and signed by the Chairman of the Motion Picture Censorship and Theatre Inspection Branch of the Treasury Department. It is addressed to Mrs. M. H. Spaulding, Chairman of the Civil Rights Union, as follows:

"Dear Madam:

> "Replying to yours of October 20th, with reference to 'Native Land.' I can only repeat what I told Mr. Hurley, that unofficially the film was too American.
>
> "As you know, this film has never been submitted officially to the board. If and when you submit the film, it will be dealt with in the regular way. All films presented for censorship, either 16 mm. or 35 mm., must be forwarded through a licensed film exchange and a regular censorship fee paid in advance."

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. SALSBERG: And now, Mr. Speaker, to this letter I merely wish to add the following information given to me by responsible officers of this organization, because I am anxious to clear the thing up, as I believe the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) wants it cleared up.

They telephoned the Censorship Board and told them they had a film and they wanted it shown. He advised them to send it up, which they did. Receiving no reply from him for a few weeks, they wrote him and phoned him and he replied that, "we cannot allow the showing of the picture because it is too American."

MR. FROST: Just where is that in the correspondence that you are stating now?

MR. SALSBERG: Well, I will have to read the correspondence. The hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) does not have to be angry on this point. I am trying to clear up a matter that is quite far-reaching. Technically, he could claim it was not submitted because it has to go through a licensed exhibitor. That has never been the practice, and it can't amount to banning a picture, if an organization can only get a picture screened through an existing agency. You would have to go to the Warner Brothers or Regal Films or any other agency and have them submit your film, but in this letter, Mr. Speaker—

MR. FROST: Any company would do it.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Silverthorne admits he had the film, he considered it "too American." If you are dissatisfied, submit it to an agency. There is where the pressure on the organizations comes in.

MR. FROST: This is getting to be more than a question of privilege. My hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) reads the correspondence and he has the right to table it. Now, surely, the incident is closed.

MR. SALSBERG: I have brought the information to the House and I

had hoped the matter would be taken up by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in the hope that these experiences will not occur again in the future.

MR. FROST: Please table the correspondence.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it should be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer):

72nd Order.

OLEOMARGARINE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 72nd Order; second reading of Bill No. 158, "An Act respecting Oleomargarine," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 158, "An Act respecting Oleomargarine," and that same be now read a second time.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I understood, perhaps wrongly . . . and I know a number of other people understood as well, that this bill was not coming up for second reading until next week.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Why so?

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is what I understood and I suggest that is what any number of people were told.

MR. FROST: No.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why not let it stand over until Monday?

MR. FROST: Why so? Let us get on with it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All right, we can deal with it today, but I would point out to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) if it was distributed before today, it was last night, and this House was sitting until 3.00 a.m.

MR. FROST: It is a short bill, you can read it in a minute.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Is the Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) going to say something on the bill?

MR. FROST: Give him a chance.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this bill, as I remember, when the bill was given first reading in this House it was a very controversial matter. It is a matter which this government felt it should face up to. That is, we felt we had responsibilities not only to the producers of dairy products in this province, but also to the consumers of this product which has been thrown on the market.

As we are all very well aware, the manufacture and sale of margarine in Canada has been banned by a federal Act for a number of years. There has been a great deal of discussion from time to time in the federal House of Commons as to whether the bill was legal or whether it was *ultra vires*.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow), I do not want to interrupt him making an important speech, but it has just been drawn to my attention that this bill appears on the Order Paper as "not printed." Now, I ask you to rule, Mr. Speaker, that if an Order appears on the Order Paper as "not printed," it was very recently distributed if at all, and should not be proceeded with.

MR. FROST: Does my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) wish to obstruct proceedings with this bill? Does he want to start a filibuster?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, but I do want the business of this province to go on in an orderly way. When a bill is marked not printed and the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) refuses a polite request to put it over, then I say it is not in order and we should follow the rules. The fact is, it was very recently distributed,

as the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) well knows. Hon. members have not had a chance to look at it. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that if the government would be reasonable about matters of this kind they would find they will get along much more rapidly than otherwise.

MR. BLACKWELL: Another of those.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am asking for a ruling by Mr. Speaker. We have an Order Paper and it says on it very clearly, "not printed."

MR. SPEAKER: The question arises whether it is printed or not printed. I do not see bills, as Speaker, and I try to be as impartial as I can. Is the bill printed or is it not?

MR. FROST: It is.

MR. SPEAKER: And does the Order Paper state "printed" or "not printed"?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The Order Paper says, "not printed," and I submit our business should go on according to the Order Paper.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am informed, Mr. Speaker, this bill was distributed yesterday morning.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Not to us.

MR. SPEAKER: I do suggest if the Order Paper reads "not printed," I must rule that the contention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) should be upheld. I am only trying to be fair to both sides.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not any evidence of submission to the opposition or the government. I want to be fair about that. I want no applause for any decision I make from either side.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I may say this, that we have no intention of appealing your ruling. Your manner has been most fair, and your rulings are impartial, and we are prepared to accept the ruling of the Chair. I might say, we have often leaned over backwards in being fair. I would say the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is raising a technical point. This bill has been distributed, and it is an error when it is marked "not printed." The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is availing himself of a chance to filibuster and create trouble in connection with this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling is, in view of the fact that my Order Paper shows the bill as "not printed," the bill should not be discussed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: I will have order in this House. There is no question and can be no discussion on the ruling of the Speaker. If you want to appeal it by vote, it is perfectly all right. Next Order, please.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 71st Order.

PUBLIC LANDS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 71st Order; second reading of Bill No. 157, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act," Mr. Scott.

MR. FROST: In this case it is marked "printed," but it is "not printed," so we cannot go ahead with that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 1st Order.

LAKES AND RIVERS IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 1st Order; third reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act," Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move that Order No. 1 be discharged, and that Bill No. 78 be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Order No. 1 discharged; Bill No. 78 stands.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 2nd Order.

FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT, 1947

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 2nd Order; third reading of Bill No. 134, "An Act to amend The Forest Management Act, 1947," Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 134, "An Act to amend The Forest Management Act, 1947."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 3rd Order.

FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT, 1948

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 3rd Order; third reading of Bill No. 136, "An Act to amend The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1948," Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 136, "An Act to amend The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1948."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 4th Order.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 4th Order; third reading of Bill No. 132, "The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 132, "The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 5th Order.

POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 5th Order; third reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act," Mr. Challies.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (PC Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 6th Order.

COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 6th Order, third reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend The Companies Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend the Companies Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 7th Order.

BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th Order; third reading of Bill No. 143, "An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 143, "An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 8th Order.

COLLEGE OF ART ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th Order; third reading of Bill No. 144, "An Act to amend the College of Art Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 144, "An Act to amend The College of Art Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 9th Order.

CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 9th Order; third reading of Bill No. 145, "An Act to amend The Continuation Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 145, "An Act to amend the Continuation Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 10th Order.

HIGH SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order; third reading of Bill No. 146, "An Act to amend The High Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 146, "An Act to amend The High Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 11th Order.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 11th Order; third reading of Bill No. 147, "An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 147, "An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 12th Order.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 12th Order, third reading of Bill No. 148, "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 148, "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 13th Order.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 13th Order; third reading of Bill No. 149, "An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 149, "An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 14th Order.

CHANGE OF NAME ACT, 1948

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 14th Order; third reading of Bill No. 152, "An Act to amend The Change of Name Act, 1948," Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 152, "An Act to amend The Change of Name Act, 1948."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 15th Order.

CONSOLIDATION OF REGULATIONS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 15th Order; third reading of Bill No. 153, "An Act to Provide for the Consolidation of the Regulations filed under The Regulations Act, 1944," Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 153, "An Act to Provide for the Consolidation of the Regulations filed under The Regulations Act, 1944."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 16th Order.

INSURANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 16th Order; third reading of Bill No. 154, "An Act to amend The Insurance Act," Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 154, "An Act to amend the Insurance Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 17th Order.

COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 17th Order; third reading of Bill No. 155,

"An Act to amend The Companies Act," Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 155, "An Act to amend The Companies Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 18th Order.

REGISTRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 18th Order; third reading of Bill No. 156, "An Act to amend The Registry Act," Mr. Blackwell.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 156, "An Act to amend The Registry Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 19th Order.

TEACHERS' BOARDS OF REFERENCE ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 19th Order; third reading of Bill No. 150, "An Act to amend The Teachers' Boards of Reference Act, 1946," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 150, "An Act to amend The Teachers' Boards of Reference Act, 1946."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 20th Order.

SCHOOLS SITES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 20th Order; third reading of Bill No. 151, "An Act to amend The School Sites Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 151, "An Act to amend The School Sites Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 21st Order.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 21st Order; third reading of Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough," Mr. Stewart.

MR. H. A. STEWART (PC Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 22nd Order.

CORNWALL STREET RAILWAY, LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY LIMITED

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 22nd Order; third reading of Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the Cornwall Street Railway, Light and Power Company, Limited," Mr. McDonald.

MR. J. L. McDONALD (PC Stormont): Mr. Speaker, I move third read-

ing of Bill No. 18, "An Act respecting the Cornwall Street Railway, Light and Power Company, Limited."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 23rd Order.

VILLAGE OF WASAGA BEACH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 23rd Order; third reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act to incorporate the Village of Wasaga Beach," Mr. Johnston (Simcoe Centre).

MR. G. G. JOHNSTON (PC Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 19, "An Act to incorporate the Village of Wasaga Beach."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 24th Order.

CANADA COMFORTER COMPANY LIMITED

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 24th Order; third reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting Canada Comforter Company Limited," Mr. Rea.

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (PC Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Rea, I move third reading of Bill No. 34, "An Act respecting Canada Comforter Company Limited."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 25th Order.

CITY OF LONDON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 25th Order; third reading of Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the City of London," Mr. Patrick.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 11, "An Act respecting the City of London."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 26th Order.

TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 26th Order; third reading of Bill No. 17, "An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke," Mr. Millard.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 17, "An Act respecting the Township of Etobicoke."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 27th Order.

SARNIA Y.M.C.A. AND Y.W.C.A.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 27th Order; third reading of Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association," Mr. Cathcart.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (PC Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting Sarnia Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 28th Order.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 28th Order; third reading of Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association," Mr. Rea.

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (PC Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Rea, I move third reading of Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 29th Order.

TOWNSHIP OF KINGSTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 29th Order; third reading of Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the Township of Kingston," Mr. Pringle.

MR. F. L. HALL (PC Halton): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Pringle, I move third reading of Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the Township of Kingston."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 30th Order.

TOWN OF TECUMSEH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 30th Order; third reading of Bill No. 27, "An Act respecting the Town of Tecumseh," Mr. Murdoch.

MR. W. MURDOCH (PC Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 27, "An Act respecting the Town of Tecumseh."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 31st Order.

CITY OF OTTAWA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 31st Order; third reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa," Mr. Chartrand.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (L Ottawa): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 32nd Order.

FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 32nd Order; third reading of Bill No. 107, "The Fire Departments Act, 1949," Mr. Blackwell.

HON LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 107, "The Fire Departments Act, 1949."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 33rd Order.

POLICE ACT, 1949

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 33rd Order; third reading of Bill No. 108, "The Police Act, 1949," Mr. Blackwell.

HON LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 108, "The Police Act, 1949."

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Wismer, that the bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend it by the addition of the following section:

"49a (i) Where the services of the Ontario Provincial Police Force are requested by a Crown Attorney, or by a board as provided in Sections 48 or 49, in connection with the industrial dispute in any municipality for the policing of which a board—"

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker—

MR. PARK:

"—or council is responsible, the authorization of the council—"

MR. BLACKWELL: I rise to a point of order.

MR. PARK:

"—of the municipality must be obtained before such a request is communicated to the Commissioner or the Attorney-General;

(2) Before the Commissioner or The Attorney-General shall agree to a request—"

MR. BLACKWELL: Why let him go on?

MR. PARK:

"—made under the provisions of Sections 48 or 49 in connection with an industrial dispute, they shall consult with the Minister of Labour, and a conciliation officer of the Department of Labour shall accompany and advise the officer commanding any group of members of the Ontario Provincial Police whose services are provided."

MR. SPEAKER: It is my impression, until I have further enlightenment that this whole matter was discussed in committee and defeated. I seek for information on this, that yesterday it was ruled out and defeated, and if that is the case, then, of course, it is impossible for us to entertain it again at this time.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I believe the same thing is true of the amendment, which was sought by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) in connection with another bill. He moved a similar amendment when the bill came to third reading.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): No, he did not move it. He just talked against it.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): No, he moved it.

MR. OLIVER: On third reading he did, but not in committee. Mr. Speaker, strictly as a matter of procedure, without discussing the merits or demerits of the amendment moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Park), I believe the amendment is out of order. It is not comparable at all with the amendment of my hon. friend the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck).

When the particular section to which my hon. friend the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) objected was discussed in committee, he there voiced his objections in committee, but he did not formally move a motion to oppose that particular section in committee.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Quite right.

MR. OLIVER: Therefore he was at liberty under the rules to move a formal motion when the bill itself was up for third reading.

In this particular matter, as I see it, this amendment, I believe, identical in language, was moved when the House was in committee on the bill, and was defeated when the bill was in committee.

It seems to me the rule in this regard is quite clear, that having been defeated in committee, we cannot then be asked

to vote on identically the same amendment when it comes up for third reading.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add this, that going a little further about this proposed amendment: when it was actually moved in committee, if we had sought to do so then, it was actually out of order because it was the addition of a complete section to the bill on an entirely new principle. However, we did not wish to stand on that technicality there, and to try to get this very same subject matter before us in this way is not only out of order, but is an abuse of the processes of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I do feel—

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I do feel there is a new principle involved in the bill, from my knowledge of it, in that it deals more or less particularly with the matter of the provincial police only, and as far as my knowledge of the bill is concerned, it deals with an over-all relationship with all types of police. In this amendment we are limited to one particular branch of police.

However, insofar as the particular amendment is concerned, Rule No. 48, on Page 113:

> "No motion or amendment, the subject matter of which has been decided upon, can again be proposed during the same session."

If my information is correct, the matter was decided upon in committee yesterday, defeated and thus concluded. Therefore I rule the amendment out of order.

The House divided.

The ruling sustained on division

AYES 55
NAYS 19

AN HON. MEMBER: Altogether.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Never saw people so frightened of a "cop" in my life.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: Order No. 34.

ASSESSMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 34th Order; third reading of Bill No. 104, "An Act to amend The Assessment Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 104, "An Act to amend The Assessment Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 35th Order.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 35th Order; third reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 36th Order.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th Order; third reading of Bill No. 131,

"An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 37th Order.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 37th Order; third reading of Bill No. 133, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 133, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 38th Order.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 38th Order; third reading of Bill No. 140, "An Act to amend the Ontario Municipal Board Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 140, "An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 39th Order.

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 39th Order; third reading of Bill No. 141, "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 141, "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself in Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Stewart in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 41.

THE TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 41st Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Township of East York," Miss Macphail.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 28 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 42.

THE CITY OF OWEN SOUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 42nd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the City of Owen Sound," Mr. Phillips.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 30 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 43.

TOWNSHIP OF SANDWICH WEST

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 43rd Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West," Mr. Murdoch.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 32 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 44th Order.

THE CITY OF ST. CATHARINES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 44th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines," Mr. Martin.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedules A, B, C, D, and E agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 33 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. H. A. STEWART (PC Kingston): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs leave to report four bills without amendment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Stewart in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Estimates of the Department of the Provincial Secretary.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Department of the Provincial Secretary; Page 75.

On Vote 135.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) propose to make an introductory statement on his Estimates?

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I need to make any introductory statement on the Estimates of this department. Most of the activities of this department travel along the course they have for very many years, and there is no particular new departure I would have to mention.

I might, however, say that there was some activity of the government which last year appeared in the Provincial Secretary's department, that is, the Research Commission, Ontario House, and other branches of that kind. These are being transferred to the Department of Planning and Development, and will be included in the Estimates of that department.

Otherwise, outside of any particular item on which any of the hon. members might wish to ask questions, the work of the department is carrying on in the usual way, and according to the usual routine.

MR. MacLEOD: The only reason I asked was it is always a pleasure to hear you.

MR. PORTER: If you wish me to speak for half an hour—

MR. MacLEOD: I cannot imagine any more profitable use of time than to listen to you.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Porter) be prepared to say a word about Item No. 7, "Provision for a General Review and Revision of the Companies Act and related statutes." That is not a large item, $5,000, but—

MR. PORTER: Yes. Provision is made for revision of the Companies Act. It has been decided that, in view of the nature of the Companies Act, and the way in which it affects many different groups and interests in active business throughout the province, the time has come to have an enquiry into the various provisions of the Act, to see how they measured up with the necessities of the present time, and the business practices at the present time, and to see what sort of a general revision might be made.

As the hon. members know, from year to year amendments to that Act are passed, and several complications have set in, and in some respects the Act requires scrutiny and revision, viewing it as a whole.

I may remind the hon. members of this committee that some revision work has been done, and the result of that, Part XII of the Act, came before the House and was passed, as the hon. members will remember.

The same type of work is proposed in regard to the Act as a whole. It was considered advisable, in view of the nature of this task, that we not merely carry it out by departmental officials, but that some persons experienced in company law should be consulted, and it would probably be necessary to pay some fee for the work and opinions they might give.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There was a draft Act circulated some months ago, as I remember it. I do not know how many people it was sent to, but was there much response on that occasion? I think it was suggested that comments might be sent in.

MR. PORTER: Yes. There were plenty of responses and a great deal of information was at hand. There was a draft Act prepared, but there were several features of it still under consideration, and were not included. We hope by next year a revised Act will be ready for presentation.

Vote 135 agreed to.

On Vote 136.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is Vote 136, relating to the Cabinet Office?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it would merit a word of explanation also from the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Porter). Two years ago, when these items were joined under the heading of "Office of the Executive Council," the expenditure reported in the Public Accounts for 1946-47 were $13,219.70. This year the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is budgeting for items to be voted, totalling $69,240, which is a very substantial increase, indicating some kind of reorganization within the government or the government's own services.

I would appreciate a word of explanation from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: Is not the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) under some misapprehension as to those figures?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think so.

MR. PORTER: Under the present Estimates the items we are now dealing with, the Cabinet Office, includes the Clerk of the Executive Council and the Clerk of the Council's staff.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. PORTER: And it also includes the Minister's staff. That is now included under the Cabinet Office.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You mean the Provincial Secretary's staff?

MR. PORTER: Yes, the Provincial Secretary's staff. Therefore, it is just a re-arrangement of those items. I do not think on the whole there has been any substantial increase over last year, but there has been a re-arrangement, and it is now called "The Cabinet Office" by reason of the fact that the duties of that branch of the department are, to a very large extent, in relation to Cabinet business.

The hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) was not here during the last session, and perhaps he would not be aware of some of

the explanations which were made at that time, but there was at that time a revision of the Provincial Secretary's Department, and the Companies Branch was carried on much as it has been before, but the Cabinet Office, or what is now called the Cabinet Office, was established for the purpose of providing a secretary for the Cabinet.

We have now a secretary, who sits in at the Cabinet meetings, prepares agenda for the Cabinet, consults various Ministers directly and that may be required for the purpose of preparing for Cabinet work, and does a multitude of other duties which arise from some of the decisions of the Cabinet, so that along with the Executive Council office, whose functions are now being performed in a similar way to what they are in the Dominion House and following, more or less the British procedure in that respect.

I might say it has resulted in great expedition in the business of the Cabinet, because prior to that time there was no formal agenda and their office matters were not brought forward in quite such an orderly way as they may now be done. It is now possible to keep the work of the Cabinet on a much more business-like basis, so that offices really combined with what was formerly the other office.

That is the purpose of the whole section.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a satisfactory explanation, and in the light of what the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has said, it appears that many items which used to appear under the vote for the main office have been transferred—

MR. PORTER: That is true, yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: —to this vote, for the Cabinet Office.

MR. PORTER: That is true.

MR. JOLLIFFE: With regard to the reorganization he has just mentioned, I was interested to see in Dr. McGregor Dawson's book an account of the practice in Britain for a good many generations; in fact, a practice which continued until not many years ago, when there were no minutes of Cabinet meetings, and they transacted their business, apparently, in rather a haphazard way. The same thing appears to have been true of the Canadian Government. Certainly the tendency in recent years has been to provide a staff for the Cabinet as such, and to manage the work of the Cabinet much more carefully. I do not think, therefore, any exception can be taken to a change of that kind, and I am sure it will work out much more satisfactorily.

There still remains, however, an increase in the cost of the operation, which I am not objecting to or emphasizing.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, do I understand that minutes are kept of the Cabinet meetings?

MR. PORTER: No, no formal minutes are kept of Cabinet meetings.

MR. MACLEOD: I was just going to suggest, if minutes were kept, it might be a good idea to send copies to hon. members of the Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Oh, no; no formal minutes are kept.

Vote No. 136 agreed to.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): I was going to ask which of the two departments was senior, Education or Provincial Secretary, and from which the salary of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) came?

MR. PORTER: The salary of the Minister will be paid, as long as I hold that position, from the Department of Education.

This present provision does not apply to me in any sense.

MR. FROST: I may say the salary of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), however, is paid from this department. It might give an opportunity to discuss that.

MR. NIXON: Who do we question on that point?

MR. FROST: Question?

AN HON. MEMBER: No question.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, since this point has been raised, and having regard to the fact the education portfolio is a very arduous and heavy portfolio, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has given any consideration to recommending to the Cabinet Council that he might be relieved of the dual portfolio and allow one of the other hon. members to take Cabinet rank? After all, when the report of the Hope Commission comes down, your burdens as Minister of Education will not be lightened, but will rather increase.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Very heavily.

MR. MacLEOD: And since you are a very frail Minister—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: —we would feel rather badly if you were overtaxed.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Get back to the old Provincial Secretary.

MR. PORTER: I appreciate very much the hon. member's (Mr. MacLeod) solicitude for my welfare. I think, though, it may be a very great advantage if I received that report from the Royal Commission on education as Provincial Secretary.

MR. OLIVER: Received as somebody, anyway.

MR. PORTER: And tabled it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Just receive it.

MR. FROST: He will receive it and transfer it immediately to the Minister of Education. There will be no delay.

On Vote No. 137.

MR. L. F. K. FELL (CCF Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, you passed over 137, I think. I wonder if the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Porter) could tell us, under Vote 137, how many civil servants now on pension are drawing less than $600?

MR. PORTER: I have no information of that here. I would have to look into that, and it would take some time. I could not answer it off hand.

MR. FELL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) could tell us whether or not the civil servants have made application, in view of the fact superannuated teachers' minimum pension of $600 has been increased, in line with those increases?

MR. PORTER: That is, for the presently superannuated civil servants?

MR. FELL: Yes.

MR. PORTER: I have had no representation.

MR. FELL: May I just finish this way: Has your department any intention, sir, of increasing the civil service pension from $600?

MR. PORTER: The matter is not being considered yet.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, this item, Vote No. 137, Civil Service Commission, requires, in my opinion, more than passing comment.

MR. FROST: Now we are into it.

MR. NIXON: Now we are away.

MR. SALSBERG: It deals with a matter that is quite fundamental in the approach to the civil service, the employees of the province. Last year up to this item we had quite a discussion in the House on the right of civil servants to organize into a trade union.

MR. PORTER: May I just rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman? This item, No. 137, deals with the expenses and the costs of carrying on the Civil Service Commission. That is what it has to deal with, and that is all it—

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware of the fact, but it gives an hon. member an opportunity to discuss the functioning of the Civil Service Commission, for which we are to provide funds.

MR. FROST: Everything is an opening for you.

MR. SALSBERG: That is right. One cannot afford to miss much here.

MR. FROST: You do not.

MR. SALSBERG: The Civil Service Commission is the body which either grants or denies those rights to the civil servants—

MR. PORTER: May I rise again to speak—

MR. SALSBERG: —of which I was about to speak before the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) interrupted me—

MR. PORTER: May I rise—

MR. SALSBERG: —and I wish he would not interrupt me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PORTER: The Civil Service Commission is a body appointed for the purpose.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): That is not a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a statement.

MR. PORTER: These are my Estimates and I am going to speak on them.

MR. SALSBERG: Why did you not do so when you brought them down?

MR. PORTER: Is the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) asking a question? He is making a speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: So are you.

MR. SALSBERG: I am speaking on an item.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. PORTER: I am going to finish what I have to say, unless the chairman tells me to sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: I think the chairman will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: He has no alternative but to tell you to sit down. Are you trying to sabotage the discussion by standing there?

MR. PORTER: The Civil Service Commission is a body appointed to administer the Civil Service Act and any powers that are given under that Act. If the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) desires that Act should be changed in any respect, then he can do it in the proper way, but this is not the place to change or amend legislation, or to determine questions which have to do with the merits or otherwise of statutes that are now on the statute books. This is an item which deals entirely with the expenses of carrying on the Civil Service Commission, which is a body appointed under statute, and any discussion here as to the merits of the statute are quite out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: I beg to differ entirely with the remarks of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter). I am not introducing legislation, I am discussing the policy of the commission for which we are asked to provide funds, and this is the opportunity and this is my right to discuss it now.

MR. PORTER: The policy of the commission is laid down by an Act of the Legislature.

MR. SALSBERG: The policy of this commission to deny the civil servants the right to organize into a trade union is not laid down by any law. It is policy which they formulate, and they deny the civil servants the right to form themselves into a trade union. Mr. Chairman, furthermore, I suggest they even refuse to recognize the Civil Servants Association of Ontario, which is not a trade union, as a bargaining agency for the civil servants of the province.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago when this matter was before the House, there was quite a discussion. The position taken by the then hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Michener) on this matter, I sug-

gest, attributed no little towards his final defeat in the election.

MR. PORTER: Just a moment, please. Just excuse me.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to yield.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman—

MR. SALSBERG: The Cabinet there is in continued caucus how to stop me from advising the—

MR. BLACKWELL: We are not. That is beyond our ability.

MR. SALSBERG: Because the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) cannot do it himself. I suggest it is not fair, I am speaking, and it is my right to inform you—

MR. FROST: Just a minute.

MR. SALSBERG: I think hon. members of the Cabinet should allow him to pilot—

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you kindly take your seat?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Who has the floor?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have the floor.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I move—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, now—I was speaking of the—

MR. FROST: Wait till you hear it. Do not get so excited.

MR. SALSBERG: I was on the floor, speaking—

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Kindly take your seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, why should he get up?

MR. FROST: Wait a minute.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would like hon. members to discuss the Estimates in Vote 137.

MR. MACLEOD: Exactly what he is doing.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And confine themselves to the Estimates that are here for the administration of the Civil Service Commission.

MR. SALSBERG: That is right.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, you are wandering all over the administration of the commission.

MR. NIXON: Is the Chairman making a ruling the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is out of order?

MR. FROST: Just a moment.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman—

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman—

MR. SALSBERG: In view of your statement, I would like to reply. I am fully—

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman—

MR. SALSBERG:—in accord with your order.

MR. FROST: You pay no attention to it.

MR. PORTER: I move the adjournment of the consideration of these Estimates.

AN HON. MEMBER: Item 137?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has been moved—

MR. SALSBERG: But Mr. Chairman, I am on the floor and nobody can move an adjournment unless I do it.

MR. PORTER: It has been done.

MR. SALSBERG: If the government wants me to move an adjournment, I will move it. Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet, recognized by you.

MR. FROST: It is 3.30, Mr. Chairman, and the arrangement with the hon. members of this House who have to catch

their trains was that we would adjourn at this hour. That is why we meet at 1.30. If the hon. members opposite would just contain themselves a little and proceed in an orderly way, we will do a lot better. The arrangement was that we should meet early, so they can catch their trains.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is the meaning of that remark? When the Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) rose he remained standing while the Chairman requested the other hon. member to sit down, and he said he had the floor, and naturally we demanded both the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) to yield to the Chairman, which they did not, standing there and rebuking us, when you should be rebuking yourselves.

MR. FROST: Thank you for your lesson in decorum. If you observed that yourself, and if you would not do so much haranguing over there, and listen to reason—

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report progress.

MR. MACLEOD: You are a little premature, are you not? You are not the Premier yet.

MR. SALSBERG: This is a Putch.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I understood the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) moved the adjournment of the debate. I am not clear whether that motion was put. Then the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) jumped up with another motion.

MR. OLIVER: Before you put the motion, is it quite clear that the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) is in sympathy with my hon. friend (Mr. Blackwell)?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. H. A. NIXON (L Brant): Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that we are discussing Vote No. 137, the Civil Service Commission. If that vote is not carried there is no debate to adjourn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: The discussion comes up again when the vote is next called.

MR. FROST: A motion is before the Chair that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; the Speaker in the Chair.

MR. H. A. STEWART (PC Kingston): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report progress, asks leave to sit again, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.35 of the clock p.m.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I was going to ask the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) three questions possibly. First of all, whether there will be a night session on Monday.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What have you in mind for the programme on Monday?

MR. FROST: Bills and Estimates.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And the third question, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) give the House any information possible as to the health of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Kennedy).

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to say the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) is feeling much better. I had the opportunity of having a chat with him by telephone, and I hope next week it may be possible for him to be here, perhaps for a few minutes during the earlier part of the week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Vol. III, No. 33

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Monday, March 28, 1949

THE KING'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1949

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 28, 1949

Game and Fisheries Act, 1946, bill to amend, Mr. Scott (Peterborough), first reading 1363
Real Estate and Business Brokers' Act, bill to amend, Mr. Blackwell, first reading 1363
Township of East York, bill respecting, Miss Macphail, third reading 1363
City of Owen Sound, bill respecting, Mr. Phillips, third reading 1364
Township of Sandwich West, bill respecting, Mr. Murdoch, third reading 1364
The City of St. Catharines, bill respecting, Mr. Martin, third reading 1364
The City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Rea, second reading 1364
Public Lands Act, bill to amend, Mr. Scott (Peterborough), second reading 1370
Mining Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Frost, second reading 1371
Consolidated Revenue Fund, bill respecting, Mr. Frost, second reading 1371
Oleomargarine, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, second reading 1371
The Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Daley, second reading 1393
Adoption Act, bill to amend, Mr. Goodfellow, second reading 1397
Farm Products Grades and Sales Act, bill to amend, Mr. Kennedy, second reading 1397
Department of Travel and Publicity Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, second reading 1398
Tourist Establishments, bill respecting, Mr. Cecile, second reading 1399
Motion to Resolve into Committee of Supply, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1400
Barristers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Thornberry, second reading negatived..... 1436
The Election Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacLeod, bill withdrawn..... 1445
Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Frost, agreed to 1446

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Speaker: The Honourable (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES

MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1949

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The House met at 3 o'clock.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

GAME AND FISHERIES ACT, 1946

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Kelley, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Game and Fisheries Act, 1946," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Are these the usual amendments?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Yes, minor amendments. There are two involving principle, that is, bringing in legislation regarding the control of aircraft in hunting, and increasing the penalties for the shooting of deer, moose, elk, and so on, out of season. Those are the two major amendments.

REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS' ACT

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Real Estate and Business Brokers' Act, 1946," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): What is the purpose of this bill?

MR. BLACKWELL: There are two clarifying amendments of no very great importance. There is one which might be considered of some importance, and that is, relief from the bonding provision of the Act for trust companies and loan companies, which are regulated anyway under the Department of Insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 45, 90, 78, 27, 81, 98, 62, 68, 84, 85, 87 and 26.

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the return submitted by the Department of Highways pursuant to order of the House made Thursday, March 17th, 1949.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Third readings. Order No. 1.

TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First order; third reading of Bill No. 28, "An

Act respecting the Township of East York," Miss Macphail.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (CCF East York): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Township of East York."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved, that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 2nd Order.

CITY OF OWEN SOUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 2nd Order; third reading of Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the City of Owen Sound," Mr. Phillips.

MR. W. E. HAMILTON (PC Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Phillips, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the City of Owen Sound."

Motion approved; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 3.

TOWNSHIP OF SANDWICH WEST

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 3rd Order; third reading of Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West," Mr. Murdoch.

MR. W. MURDOCH (PC Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the Township of Sandwich West."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 4.

THE CITY OF ST. CATHARINES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 4th Order; third reading of Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines," Mr. Martin.

MR. C. H. MARTIN (PC Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 6.

THE CITY OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 6th Order; second reading of Bill No. 23, "An respecting the City of Toronto," Mr. Rea.

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (PC Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Rea, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 23, "An Act respecting the City of Toronto."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, on second reading of this bill, a bill incorporating most of the requests of the City of Toronto, I would like to point out to the hon. members of the House that there is a very serious deficiency in the bill, in the form of the deletion of an entire section which was contained in the original bill introduced in this House.

The section deleted deals with the right of the City of Toronto to collect business tax from the Royal York and some other railroad properties which are revenue-producing, and which are in competition with other businesses of a similar nature.

For the benefit of the hon. members of the House I would like to read from the explanatory notes which the Corporation of the City of Toronto prepared for the deleted section, previously known as "Section No. 4."

The notes of the city are as follows:

"(a) for the assessment of the Royal York Hotel for business assessment;

"(b) for the assessment of a steam plant on railway lands for real property assessment and business assessment;

"(c) by section 51 of The Assessment Act, railways are assessed on a quinquennial basis. Because of the new assessment made in Toronto in 1948 and because the next re-assessment of railway lands in Toronto would not be made until 1950 for 1951 taxes, it is requested that a new quinquennial period may be commenced with the assessment made in 1949 for 1950 taxes.

"(2) This provides that if the council passes a by-law this year before the 1st of May, the new assessment in respect of real property may be made this year for next year's taxes, or in respect of business assessment may be made this year for this year's taxes.

"(3) Subject to these amendments, railways are to continue to be assessed in accordance with Sections 50 and 51 of The Assessment Act.

"(4) Provided the city establishes a three-year rotary system of assessment, this section would provide for the railway lands being assessed every three years in the same year that lands located in Ward 3 are assessed."

"This provides for the council, if it passes a by-law this year, before the 1st of May, under the new assessment in respect to real property, may be made this year for next year, or in respect of business assessment, may be made this year for this year's taxes."

There are a few more explanatory notes which I do not think are of vital importance and I will not read them, but it does seem odd, to use a very mild expression, to find this government placing itself as a barrier between the City of Toronto and this great corporation. I can find no excuse and no justification for it. I cannot understand why the government should deprive the citizens of Toronto—the property owners—of the benefits which they would receive if the city were granted the right to place a business tax on the largest hotel in the British Empire.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of this House that only on Friday, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) spoke about the need of governmental protection of enterprises which are obliged to pay dividends, when he introduced a certain bill, about which I am not going to speak now. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, there is some parallel; that he prefers and wishes to ignore, and for the life of me, I cannot see why this government protects one corporation as against others, let alone protecting a corporation against the ordinary citizens of the city.

All the City of Toronto desires to do is to place the same tax on the Royal York Hotel as is placed on the King Edward, the Prince George, the Ford, the Plaza, and every other hotel in the community. That is a reasonable desire on the part of the citizens of Toronto, and a reasonable request on the part of the city government. Why should the government offer protection to the C.P.R.? What benefits are derived and to whom for giving such protection? Why continue a discriminatory policy? If the King Edward can be taxed, why not the Royal York Hotel? What friends in high places has the C.P.R., which the King Edward Hotel has not?

HON. MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): "Joe" Salsberg.

MR. SALSBERG: The amount involved, Mr. Speaker, is not a small one; it would go into very high figures, and I suggest that the requested legislation would accomplish the following; it would increase the revenue to the city,

and thus enable it to reduce property taxes to the home owners in direct proportion; it would do away with discriminatory practices, and introduce equality of treatment for all citizens; it would remove this differentiation which has existed for a long time.

Another point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is this; there are in this House many—well, a fair number—of Toronto members. While it is true that a majority of the Toronto members now are no longer members of the Conservative Party, there are still, I am sorry to say, some Conservatives who were elected in the last election.

The City of Toronto, through the mayor and its Board of Control, called a meeting of all Toronto members to take place in the Council Chamber for the purpose of discussing with the Toronto members the bill which the corporation wished to bring in, and I am sorry to say—but I think it should be said—that not a single Tory member for Toronto showed up at that meeting.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: I think it is a shame. The CCF members, the LP members—

MR. BLACKWELL: That is for sure.

MR. SALSBERG: —were there, and we agreed with the Mayor, and the Board of Control that this legislation should be fought for, but neither the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) nor the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), nor other members of the government on the government side showed up, and I am sure I express the wishes of the citizens of Toronto, as expressed through their elected representatives when I argue against the deletion of Section 4 and ask that it be re-instituted into the bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the discussion in committee, there was some very odd opinions expressed. One of the Toronto papers reporting the discussion that took place in the Private Bills Committee, quotes the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch)—the very esteemed whip of the Conservative group in the House—as saying that the Royal York is Toronto's "Community Hall," and it should, therefore, be entitled to special consideration. May I inform my hon. friend (Mr. Murdoch) that, as a Torontonian I can assure him that the majority of Toronto people never cross the threshold of that great hotel. They do not go there. Some of them go there, of course, but the overwhelming majority have not ever been inside that hotel. If it is a "community centre," it is a centre that charges plenty for every facility it has to offer. It should be mentioned that it is becoming the community centre of the Conservative Party.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Just a Tory "snuggery."

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to say I would feel much happier in discussing this bill—I hope my hon. friend to my left and one seat down (Mr. Hanna) has not just come from the Royal York.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: I say, Mr. Speaker, that I would feel much happier in discussing this bill if I knew that the Royal York was not almost the second seat of government for the Conservative Party. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this bill with the deletion, amounts to a perpetuation of an evil and an injustice to the City of Toronto. Let no hon. member be naïve and say as has been reported, that there are many communities which would be very happy to get the Royal York Hotel. The Canadian Pacific Railway would not build a hotel in Hanover or Wingham or even in Lindsay? It builds them where there is population and profit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Half the building was vacant during the depression.

MR. SALSBERG: If the hotel was vacant, I would say it was because the

Tory Government had brought it to the depths of depreciation and no one could afford a room there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Particularly in the last six years.

MR. SALSBERG: In the last six years it has done well, but you are not responsible for it. Let no one be so naïve as to think that the Canadian Pacific Railway is sort of a Santa Claus and it has placed this beautiful, sparkling hotel in the laps of the citizens of Toronto and they do not appreciate it. They want to tax it the way the King Edward is taxed.

MR. SALSBERG: Let no one be naïve about it, the Canadian Pacific Railway is not doing the city any favour, nor is the Canadian National Railway when it places a colossal, jumbo-sized hotel in a community. They are doing it for what they get out of it. Let us put an end to this discrimination, let us do the same as is done with other hotels. Let us put an end to the barrier placed by this government before the City of Toronto in its efforts to collect the due taxes that it feels entitled to collect from that hotel.

I would like to close by saying, I will re-introduce this section in committee stage and hope we will have an opportunity to vote on it. It is unfair, it is unjustified and it should be stopped.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the government saw fit to take this section out.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): would you please withdraw that? The government did not see fit, the Private Bills Committee did, and you were on that committee.

MR. DENNISON: I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will admit that the government has a majority on the Private Bills Committee.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): I think that is quite unfair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is quite right. It is not a government bill. It is a private bill and the inference is that it is a government bill. I think you should be very fair about this. It is a private bill and I would suggest that the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) withdraw that statement. If he wishes to substitute "private" bill, I think it would be quite all right.

MR. DENNISON: I will be very glad to withdraw the word "government." I will put my statement this way: Had the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), in his genial and wonderful way, given his official approval to this section, I am quite sure the Private Bills Committee would have passed it. I want to express my regret that the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) did not attend at the discussion of this section.

MR. DUNBAR: Surely I had a right to attend Mr. Reynold's funeral that day. I was not there on the day this bill was considered.

MR. DENNISON: I will still be fair with the government, I will say that the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) did not see fit to pass the word around to his back benchers, and if he had done this I am sure the opposition which developed in the committee that day could have been stilled and this splendid section allowed to pass.

Now, let me say something about this particular section. We have heard many arguments against this section; that the railways are public utilities and, therefore, they should not be taxed. I agree, Mr. Speaker, that public utilities, as such, should not be taxed. I look upon a public utility as something that serves all the people and, serving all the people it should not be taxed. Such taxation tends to fall most heavily on the small person. However, this particular hotel, while it is owned by the railway, is not in the same class as the

rest of the railway property for this hotel only furnishes service to a small section of the people of this city and of the province. In furnishing that service to that small section of the people of this city, it enters into competition with other businesses providing the same service. I know how the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) feels about this question of entering into competition with other businesses and I am, therefore, surprised that he can draw the line at this particular point. I believe the Royal York Hotel, being in the hotel business should pay tax to the city in which it is situated.

MR. DUNBAR: Are they not paying taxes? $533 a day.

MR. DENNISON: They are not paying the same taxes as other hotels in the same business. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not just because the Canadian Pacific Railway is not able to pay taxes. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not in bad financial shape. I just looked up the history over the past few years and I find in 1937, they had only $91,000,000 reserve. That is not a bad reserve. In 1946, that $91,000,000 had increased to $350,000,000 reserve for the Canadian Pacific Railway, an increase of $259,000,000 Therefore, the company is not exactly up against the wall financially. They are quite able to pay tax on this building. I think the Royal York Hotel is very profitable to the company, very profitable and I think one of the best advertisements in the province. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Pacific Railway should be asked to pay tax on it. The funded debt of this company has been greatly reduced. In 1939, it was $228,000,000, in 1946 this funded debt had decreased to $83,000,000. In other words, the company is in a splendid financial shape, it is quite capable of paying tax and we, in the City of Toronto, feel it should pay tax. We do not withdraw from the position that utilities, as such, should be exempt from tax. I think utilities, as such, should be exempt from taxes.

Now let me give you some of the profits made by the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the years 1936 to 1946, the Canadian Pacific Railway, on its western lines made a profit of $248,150,000. In the same period, on its eastern lines, it made a profit of $126,700,000. Now, subsidies have been paid by the Government of Canada to the Canadian Pacific Railway amounting to $89,671,000 for those years. The federal lands grant to this great company have totalled 32,000,000 acres of the finest land in Western Canada. 32,000,000 acres which would be valued at, at least, at the time they received it, $10 to $20 an acre. And now, Mr. Speaker, the company clearly is not in need of any particular financial assistance from the taxpayers of the City of Toronto. I would certainly like to see Section 4 re-inserted in the Act.

Now, I want to say that when the hon. members of this Legislature sat in with the Mayor and Board of Control and members of the City Council a month or so ago to discuss Toronto's legislation, I was sorry to see no hon. member on the government side, either from the Cabinet or the back benches, at that meeting. However, I understand they did have a meeting with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). There was a section in the Toronto bill which would apply to the amount of heat a landlord supplied to his tenant in cases where he had agreed to supply a minimum amount of heat. Because of the fact that that section has been omitted from this Act, and the government may have had a very good reason for omitting it, I shall later move a second reading of a bill to enable any city over 70,000 to say there shall be a minimum amount of heat in cases where a landlord so agreed with his tenants.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, perhaps, for the information of the House, without taking up too much time, I might say the history of this bill goes back to 1904, when a commission reported on the question of the Assessment Act. Ever since then, business tax on hotel properties of railways was omitted from the powers of municipalities, they have paid a tax on the basis

of the mileage tax under the Corporation Tax Act for Municipalities in relation to Hospitals Tax. Now, whether or not, it is sound to continue that as a general public policy of the province may be a question. Nevertheless, it is a general public policy and if that was altered and municipalities generally were given the power to assess the business tax in relation to railway hotel property, it should be a general application and not for one particular municipality. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) tells me there has been no representation from other municipalities on that broad question. I put it this way to the Legislature, to indicate that the subject matter is properly on a general public policy rather than by a private bill with the policy relating only to a single municipality.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I am not anxious to prolong the debate on this issue but it seems to me that if we do have a request, as we have, from the City Council of the City of Toronto, for consideration of their problem, it should not be rejected on the ground presented by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). It is true that the cities of Ottawa and Port Arthur, I believe, as well as the City of Toronto, would be affected by public policy in this regard, and if these cities have not asked for action I do not think that should be offered as a reason why we should not proceed on the Toronto bill. The City Council of Toronto has asked for consideration.

We heard in the Private Bills Committee from the attorneys from the Canadian Pacific Railway with respect to the mileage tax that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has mentioned. On that score I think this needs to be said, that if the Canadian Pacific Railway hotel, the Royal York, were not there they would still be paying precisely the same tax. The fact that the hotel is there makes no difference to that tax at all and the hotel is an independent and profitable institution for the railway. That was admitted in the Private Bills Committee by the attorneys for the railway. There was an admission that in previous years, it did not make money. There was also an admission that in recent years it has made profits.

MR. W. MURDOCH (PC Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Park) a question. Did the counsel for the hotel in Private Bills Committee not say that after taking normal interest and depreciation, this hotel, since it was built, actually suffered a loss of over $11,000,000 from the time it was started until the end of 1947?

MR. SALSBERG: The King Edward was reorganized too.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer that question. It was stated in the committee by the attorneys for the railway, that the hotel had lost money in its early years but it had made money in the last few years. That was said in committee. I cannot confirm the figures the hon. member (Mr. Murdoch) has given. I am quite sure if he has given those figures, they are the figures given by the attorneys for the railway during discussion in the Private Bills Committee. I am not aware, however, that lack of profit has been advanced as any reason why taxes should not be paid by business profits but it is a very interesting view now offered by the hon. member (Mr. Murdoch).

The point I want to make is this, that the Royal York Hotel is in competition with all the other hotels in the City of Toronto. They are required to pay business taxes and the C.P.R. hotel is given a special and privileged position. Over the years, this railway has had special privileges and concessions from the people of Canada and the people of Ontario, and I think it is time these special concessions were stopped.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: I think this is a place where we could well head into the problem by requiring that the Royal York Hotel do business in exactly the

same way as every other hotel has to do in the City of Toronto, and as every other non-railway hotel has to do throughout the entire Province of Ontario.

Surely we are reasonable in asking that special privileges not be given to this multi-million dollar corporation at this time, and that is what we are doing if we reject the request of the Toronto City Council, who are pretty reasonable sort of fellows. I am quite sure none of the hon. members opposite would regard them as violent radicals of any kind. They see the interest of Toronto as a whole, and they quite properly ask this Legislature to give them the authority to treat the Canadian Pacific Railway Hotel, the Royal York, in exactly the same way they treat the other hotels. If we fail to include Section 4 in the bill, then what we are doing is endorsing the principle of special privilege in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): Mr. Speaker, I, along with other hon. members of this Legislature from the City of Toronto, attended a meeting called by the Mayor of the City of Toronto and the City Council, to discuss the private bills, which the city intended to present to this Legislature. I remember expressing my pleasure that the Mayor of the City of Toronto—a Conservative Mayor and a Conservative Council—had considered it wise to ask for permission to tax the Royal York Hotel.

As a travelling salesman, my job takes me from Halifax to Victoria. I stay at the best hotels wherever I go, when I can get in them, and I want to say that my experience with the Royal York Hotel is that their rates are as high or higher than any hotel in Canada, with the possible exception of the summer hotels, the Banff Springs and Jasper Park Hotels in Alberta.

Under those circumstances, I do not know why we should give this hotel any special privileges.

I also know this, that during the past three years, at various times, I have attempted to get reservations at the hotel for some of my principals, who have come out to Canada from Britain, and unless I ask for that reservation a month or six weeks in advance, I cannot get a bed in that place under any consideration, or at any price.

The hotel has been operating at capacity, it has been selling its services at the highest rates of any hotel in Canada, and yet we are being asked to give them some special privileges. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a billion dollar corporation, exploiting the people of Canada to a degree and a rate that no other corporation has ever exploited them, and I want to protest against this particular clause being taken out of the City of Toronto's bill.

In committee, if the bill is amended to reintroduce this clause, I am certainly going to support it, and I hope that every hon. member of the Legislature will also support the motion to reintroduce this clause in the bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 34.

PUBLIC LANDS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 34th Order; second reading of Bill No. 157, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act," Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 157, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: We will come back to Order No. 35 in a minute. Order No. 36.

MINING TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th Order; second reading of Bill No. 159, "An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act," Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 159, "An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: Order No. 37.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 37th Order; second reading of Bill No. 160, "An Act for raising money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund," Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 160, "An Act for raising money on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MR. FROST: Order No. 35.

OLEOMARGARINE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 35th Order; second reading of Bill No. 158, "An Act respecting Oleomargarine," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy), I move second reading of Bill No. 158, "An Act respecting Oleomargarine."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I should start where I left off the other day or whether I should start from the beginning. I might say the hon. Premier (Mr. Kennedy) was in his office this morning. He is regaining health slowly, and he expressed regret that it was impossible for him to be here this afternoon in order that he might move second reading of this bill and make a few remarks in respect to it.

I hope hon. members of the Legislature, in spite of the campaign which has been carried on over the week-end, are still prepared to use their usual good judgment in dealing with this bill, which the government feels is very fair in every respect to all parties concerned.

As I pointed out at the time this bill was introduced, the manufacture and sale of margarine in Canada had been prohibited by federal Act which was on the federal statute books for a period of 64 years. The validity of the Act was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, and they declared the Act *ultra vires* at a very unfortunate time, inasmuch as no Legislature in the Dominion of Canada was sitting at that time, or had had any previous opportunity to pass the necessary regulations to control the sale, both from the standpoint of protection to the consumer, and also to protect the dairy industry in this country.

In bringing this bill before the Legislature, the government has tried to be very fair, and to take into consideration not only those people who feel they should have a cheap spread, but also to take into consideration what the dairy industry in this province has at stake. The old saying has always been—we have all heard it—"as yellow as butter." The dairy industry feels, and I think up to a point it is quite entitled to that feeling, that they have a trade-mark inasmuch as butter is yellow. Margarine has been thrown on the market with the same colour as that product which the farmers felt they had a trade-mark on.

I think a great deal of credit is due to the dairy farmers of this province for the very reasonable attitude they have assumed in representations they have made to the government in respect to dealing with this controversial subject. They did not request this government to ban the sale or manufacture of margarine, but they have asked for certain regulations. They have even

gone so far as to indicate they would be agreeable to having it in competition with the product with the natural colour, up to a certain point.

There has been in the past few days a campaign carried on which would try to lead the consumer-public to believe that what this bill proposes to do is to ban colour from margarine. That is entirely apart from the facts, inasmuch as the 1 6/10 degrees of colour which this Act permits will give margarine approximately one-half the yellow colour which average butter has. As a matter of fact, in order that hon. members of this Legislature might be conversant with the degree of colour which this product will contain as set out in this Act, I will be glad to bring samples here so that each hon. member of the Legislature might view for himself exactly what degree of colour will be permitted under this Act. It is not an unpalatable-looking product, in fact it has a degree of yellow approximately, as I said before, one-half the natural colour of butter.

On the other hand, we must consider what the dairy industry means to the Province of Ontario. It might be of interest to some hon. members of this Legislature to know that approximately 78,000 farmers in this province—farmers and their families—depend to a great extent upon the living secured from the sale of cream which goes into the manufacture of butter. Other jurisdictions have found that it has been necessary to control the sale of margarine, which is made from imported oils, oils which are produced by perhaps the cheapest labour in the world, and brought in here in competition to a product which is produced under difficult circumstances with a great deal of expenditure and investment.

In the butter industry of this province, there was an investment, prewar, of approximately $250,000,000 in that part of the dairy industry which goes into the manufacture of butter. Already there is evidence that the butter industry in this province is in rather a precarious position. I have figures here which point out that the average price of butter-fat in 1948 in this province was 73 cents. The present price of butter-fat is 60 cents. In other words, if that price of 60 cents should carry through for the remainder of 1949, as there is every indication it will, it will mean a loss to the dairy and butter and cream producers of this province this year compared to last year of $8,640,500.

Breaking it down, this will affect approximately 75,000 producers, or an average loss of $115.20 per producer in this province this year.

I think we should realize what this group of 78,000 mean to the whole economy of the people of this Province of Ontario, when their buying power is hampered by the sale of a product made from these cheap oils. On the other hand, we do go along and feel that there are people who perhaps are unable to purchase butter at the prices which have prevailed during the last year or two, and therefore, we say that it can be sold in the province of Ontario with the degree of colour which has been stipulated here.

It is not a white article; it has approximately half the colour which natural butter has, and we feel that is being fair to the consumers who require a cheap article to take the place of butter.

There is another point which I wish to stress, and that is that we, as the government, felt that since the legislation, which had been in effect for all those years, has been repealed, there should have been uniform regulations brought in by the Federal Government in order that from coast to coast there would be the same regulations in connection with the distribution of this product. Apparently the Federal Government did not feel like assuming their responsibility, but we of this government felt that we could not evade our responsibility, not only to the consumers, to ensure them of the type of product where they would know what they were purchasing, but also to the dairy industry, which also means a great deal to the economy of this province.

We feel this is a fair bill, and it is gratifying to me to receive this morning by airmail from British Columbia a bill which received Royal assent last Thursday morning in the British Columbia Legislature, and which is identical practically word for word with the bill which we have presently before this House for second reading.

We have reason to believe that other provinces are going to introduce a similar bill. We do not feel it is fair to the consuming public that there should be a ban on this product, which has been manufactured from cheap oils, but we do feel there should be certain regulations which will guarantee to the consumer that he will be buying the type of product he thinks he is buying.

As a matter of fact, I did notice in the press where there was some doubt expressed as to the figure which I produced here the other day, that it had been found certain margarine products which are already on the market in this province, had been found to contain 30 per cent. moisture. I might say I am informed that I was being very conservative in that respect, inasmuch as it has been found that the product which has been sold varies from 14 to 33 per cent. moisture. We feel that should be regulated, and the consumer should know exactly the amount of water he is buying when he buys a pound of margarine. That will be set up in the regulations at the same percentage, 16 per cent., which is permitted in dairy butter under The Dairy Standards Act of Canada.

I think, Mr. Speaker, with this explanation, I am sure hon. members will be fair in their consideration of this bill, that they will take into consideration the consumers in this province who are provided for in the bill, and will also take into consideration the group represented by 78,000 farmers whose primary income is from the sale of butter and cream. I hope they will not take into consideration any other groups who might have any ulterior motives.

I have pleasure in moving second reading of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the margarine issue has been the subject of very wide public discussion for some time. I am inclined to agree with the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) that it was unfortunate the timing of the Supreme Court decision did not coincide with the sessions of this Legislature, or, as far as I know, of any other Legislature in Canada. I am also inclined to agree that it would be far better if this whole matter were subject to federal regulations, so that the same standards would prevail in all the provinces in which the sale of margarine is permitted. Certainly, it does not seem to us desirable that an important product of this kind should have one standard in one province and an entirely different standard in another province when, as we all know, it is a very easy matter to purchase one's supply in one province and take it into another.

Therefore, we concur with the proposition that it would have been far better if some way could have been found, either before or at the same time that margarine came to sale, for this commodity to become subject to regulations by the federal authorities.

Secondly, may I say that even prior to the Supreme Court decision, this matter was given a great deal of consideration, naturally, by the consumers of this country, and certainly by the producers. It was also given consideration by the party which I have the honour to lead in this House, the CCF.

At the national convention of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in Winnipeg in the month of August last year, we adopted a policy with regard to oleomargarine, and I am going to refer briefly to the text of the resolution adopted at that time, because I think it is essential our position should be made quite clear. The resolution was as follows:

"Recognizing that dairy farming is one of the mainstays of the Canadian farming economy, and also that an

adequate supply of bread-spread at prices the consumer can afford must be provided, the CCF proposes:

(1) the stabilization of the dairy industry, thereby encouraging butter production by:

(a) a long-term programme related to farm production costs;

(b) Regional marketing of all milk products through producer co-operative pools;

(c) direct sale of milk by the pool according to demand and prices in various markets, for example, fluid milk, cheese, concentration plants, creameries;

(d) payments to the producer for milk according to grade and not according to ultimate use;

(e) joint producer-consumer storage co-operatives, so that surpluses will accrue to these groups instead of profits going to speculators.

(2) The payment of a subsidy to reduce the price of butter to the consumer;

(3) The importation of New Zealand butter if and when Canadian butter production is inadequate;

(4) The importation and manufacture of margarine exclusively by a crown company so that the quantity, quality and price may be regulated according to the needs of the dairy industry and the consumer."

I may add that at the time that resolution was adopted at our Winnipeg convention, we foresaw the chaos which would follow a decision by the Supreme Court removing the ban on margarine in the absence of proper regulation and control by either the federal or the provincial authorities. We foresaw also that the consumer would not actually receive the full benefit of margarine becoming available at a lower price, if the product were produced and marketed by private enterprise.

As everybody knows, the price of butter in this country last year was very high, and, while the price of butter was so high, it was inevitable that the competitive product coming suddenly on the market would be sold for what the market would pay—for what "the traffic would bear"—and that the price of margarine to the consumer would not have any real relation to the cost of producing margarine. The result we foresaw was the result which occurred.

If our policy of producing and distributing margarine through the medium of a crown corporation had been adopted by this country, we believe the producers would have been better protected and the consumers would have paid less for margarine which they might have been able to obtain. That policy, however, was not followed, and shortly after the removal of the ban, margarine came on the market. I do not know how many manufacturers are in the industry at the moment, but certainly the larger processing corporations command the field. There is no question about that.

While our information is that the approximate cost of production is 20 cents a pound, the consumer has been called upon to pay a price which is completely out of line with the actual production cost.

While we do not think the consumer has received the full benefits which ought to have accrued to him from the production of a commodity such as this, I must say I share the hon. Minister's (Mr. Goodfellow) misgivings about the effect of a change of this kind on an important sector of our producers, not only because of the present situation in which as the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) has said, the dairy industry is in a precarious condition, not because of the immediate dangers to the dairy industry, but also because of the long-term dangers, and the possibility that other branches of the dairy industry may be hurt by the new developments.

Some time ago during this Session, we had a discussion under the heading of "Agricultural Estimates," about the decline in cheese production. Many of us have complained also about the decline in milk production and milk consumption in this province. All of

these things certainly give us food for thought, at least, and they do not suggest a very encouraging future for either the consumers or the producers in this province. I think some very serious consideration must be given by the government and by this Legislature to our problem of maintaining the dairy industry in an area where the costs of dairying are higher than they are in many other areas, and at the same time, assure an adequate supply at a reasonable price to the consumer.

This is all by way of saying the problem is not an easy problem to solve by any means. I now come to what is an important immediate question in connection with this bill, and in our view—there may be others who do not share that view—the important question before the House on second reading of this bill is whether there should be regulation of the manufacture and distribution of an important commodity like margarine, and our view on that question is the same as last summer and last fall, that now there must be regulation of such an important product and there ought to be supervision and control over the manufacture and distribution of margarine by both the province and the Dominion. With that general principle we, in this group in the CCF, the Opposition Group of this House—we are most certainly in agreement, and always have been. It was not only inequitable and unfair that margarine should come on the market without any regulation whatever. It was not only unfair to the butter producers, but unfair to the consumers, as I have already pointed out, who had no adequate protection against practices which this bill is designed to protect.

Now, we may have reservations about some of the safeguards, and some of the proposals which are embodied in this bill, but with the general principle of regulation we are bound to agree. The Minister has referred to the varying content of moisture in margarine, which has been tested, and it seems to me in the nature of fraud that a competitor of butter should come on the market and instead of adhering to the 16 per cent. limit, which has been applied to butter, has been sold to consumers with a moisture content, if my information is like that of the Minister, varying from 20 per cent. up to 30 per cent. and more. Now, the effect of that practice simply was that people bought margarine under the wrong impression about the value of what they were getting. They were, I think, entitled to assume that what appeared as a substitute for butter would have approximately the same ingredients as butter in the same proportions, and I do not think there is any dispute about the fact that basically the ingredients are very much the same. Basically both margarine and butter should consist of 2 per cent. salt, 16 per cent. water, and 82 per cent. fat. But margarine has been made in this country in such a way that people paid in some cases for a good deal of water, without knowing they were paying for water, and we do not believe that practice was consistent with the principle of honesty or good business, nor do we believe it was fair to the consumer and certainly was not fair to the producer of butter. Now, I am not making an argument against water—I do not wish to be misunderstood; I have no deep-seated prejudice against water, in its place, nor do I object to paying a water-bill to the municipality where I happen to reside, but that is what the consumers of this province have been doing—they have been paying for water in the guise of something else when they bought margarine, with the result that the saving in price was not as great as it appeared to be. I cite that example to show how important it is that the product should be regulated and that the consumer should be protected against practices of that kind.

Now, I am not going to say very much more about this matter. Some of my colleagues will also speak. We have, as I say, some reservations about certain provisions of this bill, but with the general principle of regulation we are in agreement, and I shall therefore vote for this bill on second reading.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, following the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), I want to make a number of comments in regard to the bill, whatever number it is. It has been moved for second reading by my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow).

When this product, called oleomargarine, came onto the market in this province, it was, I am sure, abundantly clear to everyone that if the public—and that is an all-inclusive term—if the public were to be protected, then certainly a bill of this character, setting up regulations for the production of the commodity, should be on the Statute Books of this province.

Now, in regard to the matter that has been raised here, as to whether these regulations should be set up in the province, or in federal jurisdiction, I think perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there is some room for argument and some ground for a difference of opinion as to whether these regulations should be federal or provincial. I recall in my limited study of this problem, that in the United States they have no federal regulations. Each state within the Union regulates the manufacture and the distribution of margarine according to the particular test of that particular state, and it would seem to me that even in Canada there might be varying differences between the provinces—as there are varying differences between states—as to how they would like to handle the margarine question. So I would not go along with either one of my friends on that point—certainly not completely at any rate. I agree with the government in this regard; that they passed legislation that sets up regulations to control and regulate the sale of this product. Those regulations should make it abundantly clear that the public when they buy margarine, know what they are buying—that they should know what the moisture-content is, that they should be aware of the analysis of that product, that the analysis should be printed on every package so that the public at all times can be informed as to what they are buying and what the ingredients of the product is, for which they are spending their money. I think we all agree with that irrespective of what part of the House we sit in.

Now, when this problem arose in Ontario, as it arose in other provinces, there was conflicting interests to be brought together. We had on the one side the people in industrial areas who wanted a cheap spread for their bread and whatever they might use it on, and we had, on the other side of the picture, over 70,000 farmers in this province who, through many years of toil and hard work, have built up the dairy industry of this province. Now, it was a reasonable thing that these men in this province who are in the government, should try to bring those differences to meet, on a common ground, and to undertake to serve the public interest in this matter rather than the interest of one side or the other exclusively.

I would say to the House quite frankly, so far as I am concerned in this bill this afternoon, presented by the government, it meets in my judgment the public interest so far as distribution of same—of oleomargarine—is concerned. We are not forbidding the sale of this product to those who would use it, but we are, on the other hand, safeguarding those people who buy that product so that they know what they buy and they are protected against an inferiority product. On the other hand we are giving a measure of protection and stability to the dairy interest of this province.

Now, it has been said here this afternoon that butter was high during last summer—70 some-odd cents a pound. Now, I think the hon. members of this House should know that that was not a price under which the farmer became very wealthy or more liable to income-taxes. Even that high price for butter this summer was just the cost of production to the farmers of Ontario, and that even with 70 cents-a-pound butter this last summer, thousands of dairy cattle left the Province of Ontario to find a new home in the United States. They went there because United States

buyers could pay more for our cattle than could farmers get by milking and selling the milk on many of the farms on which that product got sold. So there is this other point brought up by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that he said would hurt the dairy industry and that is, what would happen if we did not have regulations and control in regard to the sale of this product would have a very far-reaching effect. I think the people of this province should be aware, to a degree at least, of some of those far-reaching effects. Not only, my hon. friend, would the cattle-herd of the dairy industry be effected, the dairy industry on that farm alone, but its effect would be much more widespread than that, and if the farmers had to go out of the production of butter from dairy cows, the natural inclination that would be followed, as surely as day follows night, would be for the farmers to go into beef production, and into allied lines and to over-do those particular lines to the detriment of the whole industry. What we are trying to do, is to maintain some sort of balance in this matter, so that everybody in the cities can get the product, so that the farmer on his farm will have left at least a measure of stability.

So far as we are concerned in this particular group, we are going to support the second reading of the bill. We believe that it is a good solution of what we all agree is a difficult problem to solve.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it is quite obvious that the government found it very difficult to find what it considered to be an adequate answer to this problem.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Treasurer): Apparently we found it, though.

MR. MACLEOD: Speaking in this House on the 12th of March, 1947, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) said the following:

> "A measure will also be introduced which will provide for the clear distinguishment of all forms of sale to the consumer between butter and oleomargarine."

One wonders why it took the government so long.

MR. FROST: A couple of weeks.

MR. MACLEOD: No, I am talking about March, 1947. If you want to look at it in *Hansard* you will find it there. Why did it take you so long? Why did you wait until the dying hours of the session before you implemented the undertaking that was given by the Minister at that time? I suggest what this government is trying to do is to carry butter on both shoulders. You are trying to satisfy people in the country and you are trying to satisfy these big corporations who have now entered the margarine business. You are trying to steer a middle course.

Now, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in my opinion it is a scandalous state of affairs that our people in the Province of Ontario should have to use ersatz butter in one of the great dairy producing provinces of Canada, and I say that if the Government of Ontario were really desirous of protecting the consuming public against these unscrupulous packing barons, you would have brought in an Act intituled "The Butter Subsidy Act," and you would have demanded that the Federal Government join with this government in subsidizing the dairy industry so that they can put good rich butter on the table of every citizen in the Province of Ontario. That is the proper way to handle it. I repeat that—that subsidy should be shared equally by the Dominion and the Provincial Government. After all this is not Nazi-Germany. We have not reached the stage where it is necessary to put ersatz food on the tables of the people.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) referred to the great dairy industry, which is capable of producing all the butter which the people of Ontario need, and a surplus, to supply the people of other provinces. There is a suggestion now that within a very few days there may be an increase in the price of

milk, and we were told not long ago that milk consumption in the Dominion of Canada is 40 to 50 per cent. below a desirable limit. How long will it be before Canada Packers or somebody else, will devise a substitute for milk, and if that is put on the market perhaps there will be a bill from the government side of the House restricting the colour of that, to make it red or green or black or some other colour.

MR. MACLEOD: This morning, along with other hon. members of this House, I was inundated with a great flood of telegrams. I could not handle them on this desk I had to move over there. I am not taken in by that at all, I know perfectly well that "lobby" was organized by Canada Packers, I know that perfectly well. As a matter of fact, I was half tempted to reply to every one of those telegrams, addressed in care of John S. McLean and send them collect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: I think that might not have been a bad idea, making him pay coming and going. I want to say this, if I had been able to contact every one of these 175 or 180 people and asked them the question: "Which would you prefer, butter or margarine?" Their answer would be: "Butter." That is what the people of this province want, butter, and they are being forced to buy this inferior product simply because they cannot afford to pay the prevailing price of butter in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we are absolutely opposed to the colour provision in this bill, because we believe it to be discriminatory. We believe the effect of this discrimination will be felt in every neighbourhood store throughout the Province of Ontario. You will have "butter citizens" and "margarine citizens" and you will be humiliating people who have to go and buy this miserable looking product and thus call attention to the fact that they are not in as good an economic position as their neighbour. You will carry that discrimination into every school in the Province of Ontario where children bring their lunch. Children will be told they are margarine children or butter children or what have you.

MR. MURDOCH: Not until you stirred it up.

MR. MACLEOD: What is that?

MR. MURDOCH: It is propaganda all around.

MR. MACLEOD: It is not propaganda at all, it is a device that will establish two classes of citizens, will accentuate the fact that there are two classes of citizens in this province now—the rich and the poor. I am absolutely opposed to that, just as I would be opposed to giving milk to the poor children in the public schools and thereby call attention to the fact that they were poor children. If we are going to subsidize milk to the extent of giving it to school children, I think they should all get milk and not single out those who are in an unfortunate economic position.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we believe both this government and the Federal Government is dodging its responsibilities by failing to take the obvious step of subsidizing this industry so it can provide butter at a price that will enable people to buy it and because we believe, on the other hand, that powerful interests in Kitchener and Toronto and other parts of this country are attempting to exploit the fact that people cannot buy butter, we have reluctantly decided to have nothing whatsoever to do with this bill. Our attitude towards it is completely negative. We say, if this regulation is going to take place, if margarine is here to stay, then it is not the responsibility of this Legislature, to regulate it but it is the responsibility of the Federal Government which has under its control the Pure Food laws of the Dominion of Canada. If we are going to have legislation of this kind there is nothing to stop us bringing forward legislation in the Province of Ontario, to the effect that Anacin will be a different colour from

Aspirin or Dodd's kidney pills should be a different colour from Dr. Chase's nerve food. This is not in the provincial jurisdiction at all, it should be flung back to the Federal Government because I think the Provincial Government is responsible for the whole Act and it is they who capitulated to characters like Senator Euler who wanted to force this product on the market. If I were in your shoes I would toss it back at them and say: "It is your responsibility," and see to it that the dairy industry is placed in the position where they could produce butter at a price the people can pay. The people do not want margarine at all and I think instead of facing up to your responsibility, you are simply dodging it. You are trying to put across the device here that will leave your position with the farmers unimpaired and at the same time not get into too deep difficulty with the packing barons of the Province of Ontario, who no doubt contribute very heavily to the coffers of the Tory Party. When this bill comes up for division, we will vote against it.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Could I have the page and reference to *Hansard* that the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) referred to?

MR. MACLEOD: Unfortunately, I have the quotation but I do not have the source. However, I will get *Hansard* and see if I can find it.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, I have read *Hansard* for March 12th completely through and I see no such reference.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Mr. Speaker, there are one or two features of the bill which seem to me could stand further discussion in the general discussion of the bill. I would like to identify myself with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) when he says that we agree, I certainly agree that there must be regulalations. However, I think there are some features of this bill that are very deficient and they certainly ought to be rectified before the bill finally passes this House and, while I will be prepared to support the bill in second reading for the purpose of bringing it to committee, I must serve notice now that in committee I certainly will want some changes made in some provisions of the bill. I suggest to the hon. members of this House that there are certain regulations brought in here that are not consistent. I believe it is the purpose of the bill to have margarine distinctly distinguished from butter and from any other food spread of that type.

I suggest in the section dealing with the content that the bill does not go far enough in making the necessary regulations and, therefore, creating the distinction which the bill is apparently designed to do. I suggest also that it is hardly fair to suggest to the restaurant keepers and so on, that they have to get their menus printed and put on there—"We serve margarine," or some other type of trade name representing margarine. Then, it seems to me, that restaurant keepers, if they start using margarine would have to use margarine all the time as they do not want to have their menus printed with "margarine" printed on them and change them the next day. They change the items on a menu but a menu is usually printed first and the list is put in afterwards. It might be a small matter but people may use margarine one day and want to use butter the next. It seems to me it should be done some other way than is suggested in the particular subsection. They may display a sign which clearly points out that they are serving margarine or butter for that one day. However, that is not the main objection I have to the bill.

I have here on my desk today four packages of margarine. The hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) indicated that he would bring them and I would invite hon. members of the House to come and inspect these packages when we have recess. On one package is marked, 1.5 per cent. and I would suggest when you look at this, if you care to, you will find that the 1.5 per cent. which is just about the limit provided in the bill now before us, that 1.5 per cent is not much off the colour of domestic shortening.

It is just about the same thing. It does not provide much colour over and above domestic shortening. It is a pretty sickly colour and it is 1.5 per cent.

Then, I have another package here labelled 1.7 per cent which is sort of a bilious yellow—

MR. MacLEOD: Sort of a Tory look.

MR. MILLARD: I say "a bilious yellow." It is not very attractive. On the other hand, there are many pounds of butter go on the market which are not much better than the 1.7 colouring at certain times of the year. I suggest to you that it would not be altogether distinguishable from the 1.7 margarine that I have here before me.

Then, I have another package with 2.7 and it seems to me that it does provide something of a compromise in the amount of actual colour that the product contains. I have another package here labelled 5.9 per cent., and then you are getting into the shades of good, rich, yellow butter as we see it on the market every day. Now, I believe there is and I would suggest that, in the terms of an amendment during committee stage of this bill, I believe there is a happy medium that could be struck between the different colours. I want to see people who are purchasing margarine, if they feel they must—should purchase margarine in place of butter, I want them to see they are not fooled with a mixture of some kind, of domestic shortening added in. There is not sufficient distinction between 1.5 per cent. and domestic shortening, and I want the people to know that no unscrupulous manufacturer who gets stuck for the necessary quantity of margarine he has on hand should take shortening and mix them together and sell it and nobody would know the difference. I want to attract attention to the fact that I agree whole-heartedly with the idea of no mixing of butter and margarine. I think there must be regulations to that end, I agree whole-heartedly, also, with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in regard to moisture content. I think that definitely must be put on the same basis as moisture content that the butter regulations call for.

I want to draw attention to one other feature of this bill which seems to me very important. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) would not mind if I draw his attention to it. In the bill, we leave it to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in other words to the Cabinet, regarding licensing. Now I am perfectly agreed to leaving the matter of licensing to the authority in that regard. They license other bodies for other purposes, and I have no objections to that licensing. However, in Section B of that particular clause, prescribing standards of quality for oleomargarine, it seems to me on that point we should be careful when we start to establish standards of quality. I do not know if hon. Ministers of the Cabinet are qualified to say what should be. I do not know, after what I heard from the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) about oleomargarine actually killing calves in 60 days, whether or not they would know what is a safe standard for margarine.

I suggest very seriously that that is putting a very great responsibility on people who may or may not have the qualifications to set the standards, and I do not know who there is to whom they can go. It seems to me that clause should be very seriously considered as to what is the proper standard for margarine, which is going to protect the health of our people so that they know that when they buy a package of margarine they are getting a pure and wholesome food, and that it does not contain any ingredients injurious to health.

Then the last section of that particular clause seems to me altogether unnecessary. Here we have a bill which in essence is a regulating bill. I do not believe, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said, that it deals effectively with the problem in the final analysis, but it is a bill which regulates all the other clauses regulat-

ing the manufacture and distribution of margarine. It is that clause which says:

> "Respecting any other matter necessary or advisable to carry out effectively the intent and purpose of this Act."

Now the "intent and purpose of the Act," I suggest, is not sufficiently clear that we should hand a blank cheque to the Government in Council to make any other regulations or prescribe any other measures of control they might deem necessary or advisable. Frankly, if that is going to be the situation, Mr. Speaker, it is useless for us to consider this bill further because, just as soon as we give the authority over, then any kind of regulations can be made or not be made according to the judgment of The Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

With this reservation, and with due notice that I want some changes regarding the colour provision in the Act, and regarding the use of the words "a substitute for butter," because it seems to me that while it may be an alternative to butter, we should not use this term "substitute for butter," because in that respect I am inclined to go along to some extent with the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). I do not want people, if they decide to buy margarine, to say they are buying it because it is a substitute for butter, and it is proposed to put on every package "This is not a substitute for butter." I suggest earnestly that has no place in this particular Act. With this reservation, I personally will support the bill, but I must impress upon the hon. members of this House that some changes will have to be made in it, particularly with regard to the proposal on colouring, before I can support the bill, and before I think it will give any protection to the dairy industry, or to the consumer public, who will be concerned with the passage of this bill.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege; in some remarks I made a little while ago I quoted some words which I attributed to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and stated they had been spoken in this House on the 12th of March, 1947. I now find I was badly briefed, and the words appeared with some quotations from a speech delivered by him on the 12th of March, 1947, and I was under the impression that the words quoted on the subject of oleomargarine had been spoken on the same occasion. As the hon. members of the government no doubt realize, I quoted from a section from the Speech from the Throne, which indicates that, I, like the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) may sometimes still be fallible.

MR. FROST: Who briefed you? "Joe"?

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, in rising, I am not going to indulge in any lengthy discussion on this bill. I agree whole heartedly with what my hon. Leader (Mr. Oliver) has said, and I agree to some extent with what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) has said. There is, however, one section to which I object, and I had that in mind for some days, so I am not influenced by any editorials in the *Globe and Mail*.

I agree that "substitute for butter" should not be used. Oleomargarine is not a substitute for butter, any more than butter is a substitute for oleomargarine, or that Crisco is a substitute for lard, or lard is a substitute for Crisco.

I am interested in the oleomargarine being sold in New York State, and I hold in my hand a package of Parkay margarine, produced by the Kraft people. And they say this:

> "Oleomargarine may be coloured under federal law without liability to tax only by a private family for household use, without compensation; co-operative clubs or fraternities for use of members where boarding expenses are pro-rated; and institutions under the complete control of the United States or a State or a political subdivision of a State, for use of inmates or employees."

The ingredients of this oleomargarine are practically the same as called for here; 80 per cent. vegetable oil, 15.7 per cent. moisture rather than 16.7 per cent.; 2.5 per cent. salt. I want to know from the hon. Minister who introduced this bill (Mr. Goodfellow) this; this package I hold here is supposed to be 1.6 and in it, Mr. Speaker, they enclose a plastic capsule which will colour the margarine to 3 per cent. or five per cent. colour of yellow. I am wondering, Mr. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) if there is any regulation going to be instigated which will stop an oleomargarine concern from inserting a plastic capsule to be used in colouring for private use? According to the instructions, the margarine has to be out of the ice box or refrigerator for two hours; you do not need a mixing bowl, but you can colour it in two minutes by pressing the capsule into the oleomargarine, and I was wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) had anything in mind to prevent inserting a capsule like that, for private household use.

MR. GOODFELLOW: In reply to the question by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) I think it would be better if the consumer bought the colouring at a drug store, instead of getting it in a capsule.

MR. HOUCK: In other words, you will not allow the capsule?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No.

MR. R. A. McEWING (L Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, in connection with this bill; I think this has a very far-reaching effect on a basic industry in the Province of Ontario. To use the argument that the dominion should make that regulation—I do not know whether every province in Canada is in exactly the same situation as the Province of Ontario. I think the different provinces vary so much that it is absolutely necessary for each province to make some regulations different from the others, and none should be taken as a guide to what some other province wants to do.

After all we in Ontario are in one of the greatest provinces in Canada, and we should give some leadership in that respect.

There are one or two things with which I do not agree. I do agree with the principle of the bill, and I am quite prepared to support it to that extent. In committee there are one or two things I think we can amend without much difficulty.

The reason I am concerned about this bill is that we must realize that somebody is vitally concerned with a campaign that is being put on, especially over the past week-end. This is going to disturb the dairy and butter industry of this province far more than many people realize because as my hon. Leader (Mr. Oliver) has said, the moment you force the producers of cream into some other channels, you will undermine them. You produce a surplus, and you immediately destroy the structure price, and you will upset the whole industry while you are doing it.

The farmers have produced a quality which has been brought about by regulations and by demand of the public over a great many years. It has not just happened overnight, like oleomargarine has happened in Ontario. It has taken a great deal of care and feeding, and in the breeding and raising and handling of livestock, to make that butter, and to try and keep it to an even colour, because nature does not give pasture the year round and for that reason it has become a recognized fact that trying to establish an average all the year round has been the object of the dairy industry, and they have gone to a great deal of trouble to do that.

On the other hand, if this product which came in overnight is as good as some of the circulars would have us believe, why do they want to imitate butter? I think if I was producing something which was distinctive, and the housewives up to some 90 per cent. gave their approval of it, I would want a name of its own, and not to have it recognized as a substitute for anything.

For that reason, I do not like the words "as a substitute for butter" as used in Section 2 in "A" and "B," where they must be seen. I would say that if the article is what the people want, and if a sign is up "We serve oleomargarine," that should be sufficient. As far as the argument used by my hon. friend from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) that you are going to place class against class; I do not think anybody going to school ever opened a sandwich to see what was in it. In fact, some of them used peanut butter, and there were no slurs passed at them for using it.

MR. MACLEOD: There is a difference between jam and butter.

MR. McEWING: Some of them used jam, and nothing was said. They had some other things, too, I suppose. I think that is propaganda put forth by people who want to produce it. I think that is where that comes from.

MR. MACLEOD: No, I have it patented; I never get it from any propaganda.

MR. McEWING: You have some good ideas, I will admit that—and they are your own.

MR. MACLEOD: If they subsidize guns, they can subsidize butter.

MR. McEWING: I would ask in committee that this part be deleted, "as a substitute for butter." I think it should stand on its own feet, as the butter industry is prepared to stand on its own feet, and we do not want any subsidy. I do think the farmers have a right to have some safeguards, because in many ways they have not the safeguards other classes of people have. Consider, labour, for instance. They have their 44-hour week—

MR. MILLARD: That is what you think.

MR. McEWING: Well, 48 hours, if you want it that way. Some of you have 44 hours, in many cases. In balancing up your income from that, with the income of the farmer, you perhaps do do not realize that instead of a 44-hour week or a 48-hour week, these farmers are working in some cases 60 and 70 hours a week, because you cannot handle the dairy industry without doing that, and there is no pay and one-half for overtime, like there is with labour, and there is no pay and one-half for Sundays, when you have to go out and look after your livestock which is producing this butter you think is dear. If we got paid a pay and a half, butter would be dearer than it is today. I think you should give the farmer some consideration on this. They are not as well organized; they cannot put out a report like that presented by the Retailers Association, and I submit, Mr. Speaker these things are some of the things we want embodied in this bill.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague (Mr. MacLeod) has already stated, we find it necessary to vote against this bill on second reading, not because we are opposed to every part of the bill. We are not. But it seems that some hon. members fail to grasp that one of the essential parts involved is Section 4, and I cannot see how you can be against Section 4, and still vote for the bill on second reading.

We are in favour, Mr. Speaker, of the regulations for controlling the production, and the water content, and I even agreed with the proposal that restaurants publicly designate the fact that they do serve oleomargarine and not butter. But we do take exception to Section 4. I think, Mr. Speaker, we should speak plainly about this question. Frankly I feel that the government is doing this with tongue in cheek; that is my opinion.

MR. BLACKWELL: Better in the cheek, than wagging the way yours does.

MR. SALSBERG: If anybody's tongue ever wagged in this Chamber more than the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) when he comes in after hours of absence, and makes everybody

wonder whether he is coming or going. Perhaps he is going, but does not realize it yet. For instance, somebody has said that he is gone.

I say that you are either permitting the production and consumption of margarine, or you are not, and if you are permitting its production, and are permitting its distribution, then there should be no attempt, as is being made by the government, to impress people, and to discriminate against the poorer sections of the people in the form of differentiations, and I suggest also there should be no attempt to let the farmers believe that they have protection, as far as colouring is concerned, and I doubt whether they will ever be so protected.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be recognized that the farmers of this province are fully entitled to all the protections they desire—every bit of protection.

I say they will need more and more protection as the years go by, because this country is no longer a country in which agriculture is the dominant economy; it is becoming fast a country in which industry is dominating the economic life of the country. As this happens, I suggest to you that big business will become more and more formally settled in the saddle and that the interest of the farmers will require more battling for than in the past. This should be recognized.

However, as my hon. leader of our party said here, this government could offer protection to the farmers without this discriminatory policy they are pursuing. He mentioned one instance, the subsidizing of butter. There would be nothing wrong, and there are other ways. The government which now speaks of "defending the interests of the dairy farmer" refused to subsidize milk consumption and yet very large sections of the community have been demanding of the government that they subsidize milk consumption. This government has rejected, year in and year out, a bill to share in the cost of providing free milk to all children in our public schools.

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully direct the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) to the fact that we are discussing the margarine bill and not the subsidizing of free milk. I do think we should try to confine our discussion and debate to the question immediately at hand. Thank you very much.

MR. SALSBERG: I accept your guidance, Mr. Speaker. I was merely trying to point out that the argument advanced in the text, and I think an integral part of it—the protection of the farmers—is one that could be approached from more than one angle. I suggested the government could, through certain subsidies, offer sufficient protection to the dairy farmers without discriminating against the users of margarine. Not having done this, the argument of the government to me sounds a bit hollow.

Insofar as the consumption of the product among working people, whether you call it a substitute or not, it is an undeniable fact that working-class families buy it more than any other section of the population. They buy it because butter is high in relation to their income. It is very interesting that most telegrams come from working-class areas. I know who paid for them, but it is interesting they were signed in groceries and other shops in working-class areas, because they are the people concerned.

I do not rely only on these telegrams, of which the largest number that I received were mimeographed, if you please—mimeographed beforehand—but I have spoken to workers' wives, mothers in their homes, and they spoke very frankly about it. A lady told me only this morning: "Imagine if you have four children and you have to feed them, what the difference in price means; it means a great deal to a family such as mine." Let us face these facts I do not think we should discriminate against that section of the population. They are buying it because they have to, and if they have to, then let us not put them in a position where it will make life difficult.

This lady said something which had not occurred to me. She said: "You know, it will look like lard if you leave it at the proposed colouring, and children will not want to eat it." I do not know whether it will or will not look exactly like lard, but the limited colouring you are permitting will make it look almost like lard, and I can imagine children revolting against bread that will be buttered with this product, if it will look that way.

Then there is another point, and I cannot imagine the government is unaware of it. It was raised by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck). The point is, that certain producers of margarine are also providing a capsule to colour the margarine that is in the hands of the purchaser. It is impossible the Department of Agriculture is unaware of it, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that is what I had in mind when I said it appears to me as if this bill was brought in with "tongue in cheek." Here is a whole number of advertisements dealing with this very point in the United States, where, as was already mentioned by the hon. Leader of the Liberal Group (Mr. Oliver) here, there are different laws in different states in the country below. That is true. What they do is either produce margarine in butter colour or in pale white or ivory and they provide a little capsule which goes into the pound of margarine; you just squeeze it a little and it spreads and is exactly like butter. I submit it will be next to impossible even if the government has it in mind, and so far there has not been any statement from the government side that they are aware of this problem, although I cannot imagine the Department of Agriculture not being aware of it, I do suggest even if they are aware of it, I cannot think of any way of stopping it. You might say, and it was implied by the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) who introduced the bill, or at least who pilots the bill, that they may stop the producers from putting this capsule inside. Well, I find in these advertisements, which are to be found in *The Saturday Evening Post*, and were provided to me by a person interested in this question, I mean, a housewife—I do not read *The Saturday Evening Post*—who brought this to me and said: "Look what is happening." In the United States there are states where the capsule is inside and there are states where it is not inside, but the grocer gives you a little pill of colouring. Are you going to stop grocers from giving women a little bit of colouring?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, if we bear in mind how much money is involved in this, and it is big business, you saw how big business can organize a campaign; I wish the working class and all its organizations would learn such things—look at the bundle here, and I know the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) also got a bundle—

HON. DANA PORTER (PC Minister of Education): It was not very effective, though.

MR. SALSBERG: Because, when it was delivered to my house, the messenger told me: "Now, I have to go to Mr. Blackwell's house with a bundle like that," and he said: "I just came from Mr. Dennison's house, and he had a bundle like that."

It is obvious what can be done by big monopolies and big business when they get going, and I suggest you will not be able to stop them from providing colouring capsules in one way or another. I suggest it will be done either inside or outside, in the grocery or any other scheme they will work out, and you will not be able to accomplish what you claim you are accomplishing, it will just inconvenience and make it unpleasant for perhaps a section of the population.

I want therefore to end by saying we are in favour of most of the controls and regulations contained in the bill. I think the point made by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard), about the necessity of stating it is a substitute, is a good point and should

be borne in mind when we are in committee stage, but we do object to and disagree with Section 4, which is discriminatory, unfair, and in the long run will not protect the farmer, as it is intended to convey by this bill. For that reason, we are voting against the bill in second reading.

MR. T. H. ISLEY (CCF Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I was quite relieved that this government has seen fit to introduce a bill protecting some 75,000 farmers in this province who are cream producers, the farmers who have invested over three-quarters of a million dollars in stock equipment and lands.

AN HON. MEMBER: Million?

MR. ISLEY: Three-quarters of a billion.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is better.

MR. ISLEY: I said "relieved," because last week-end while I was back at my farm, I was almost flooded out with telephone calls asking when there was going to be something done about regulating margarine, and this week-end when I was staying in Toronto, I was flooded with telegrams and letters, so I hope it will be concluded before next week-end.

I think those people who have sent telegrams are probably not quite familiar with how important a matter this is, and what the cream producer has meant to the province. When you look at the production of beef, and I think beef, hogs and cream, to my knowledge—and I think hon. members will agree with me—are more or less tied and going down together side by side.

As I can recall when I was back as a cream producer, I looked to the cream, to the money I received for the cream, as a weekly income to keep my farm operating. I would have had to have some other source of income, and I am sure that is general right across the province, while finishing those beef cattle or hogs; also, the skimmed milk was very valuable, and so the three industries run hand in hand.

There is also another important factor I feel the people are overlooking, and that is milk must be gathered every day, but many times these cream-producing farms are situated in the way-back concessions then it would not be possible to collect milk from these farms each day, therefore they are the cream producers because the trucks are going in there in the summer twice a week and in the winter time once a week. Therefore, it would not be possible, because the cost of gathering milk in those back concessions would be much too high, and I think that is another important thing to keep in mind when we are dealing with this bill.

I do not think it was the intention of the Federation of Agriculture, or the farm people in general, to feel margarine should be banned. I do not think it is the intention of the farm people that there should not be a cheap breadspread at the present high price of butter, and I am sure the Federation and the farm people who backed the Federation are only asking a fair thing, and that is that there be some type of regulation and protection against unfair competition.

When I speak of "cheap breadspread," I would like to recall the time when butter was at a cheap level, back in the pre-war days. We had cheap breadspread, but we also must consider that it was due to the efforts of the boys and girls back on the farms—the unpaid labour—who made it possible for that cheap breadspread. Often you would pick up a paper, and this is the saddest of all: where a mother left her children in the house to go out and milk the cows so that we could enjoy butter on our table, and something happened in the house and not only does the house burn but I have seen, only two weeks ago, in the paper, where an entire family was wiped out by fire. That is why in the past we have had cheap breadspread.

Then there was a trimming of prices, too low prices, and that is why we have had a scarcity of butter.

Just what is this going to mean to the Ontario farmer or the Canadian farmer as far as that goes? Two weeks ago today, I attended an auction sale, and just at that very time butter had taken that 11-cent drop. It was noticeable at once that cows had dropped anywhere from $50 to $100—that is grade cows had dropped $50 to $100 per cow. That is a very serious thing among this group of people, and I think we need some type of protection now.

I am not saying this bill is going to solve the entire problem of the cream producers, but I certainly think we must have some protection now, and I may say in this bill there is something to stop some corrupt practices, certain clauses in there, and I am sure if we once have the bill that we can from time to time, if it does not work out properly, change certain clauses. We can probably do it in committee stage, but what the cream producers of this province want now is protection, and they want it now.

On those grounds, I certainly feel that I have got to support this bill on second reading.

MR. D. BAXTER (L Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I was the first one, I think, in this Legislature to mention the word "margarine" and that inasmuch as at that time I asked that the farmers be protected against fraudulent substitution and also that definite rules and standards be established for the manufacture and sale of margarine, I must in all fairness at this time state that I am quite satisfied with this bill.

At that time it was stated by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that I was "skating all around," but nevertheless I got exactly what I asked for, and I do not think anybody could do much better than that.

However, I want to say this, that I think there are two things which should be considered at this time in all fairness to the farmer in connection with the situation in which he finds himself today. In Ontario, and indeed throughout Canada, agricultural economy is in a precarious position as we change from wartime to peacetime, as it were. Particularly as in regard to dairy herds, we find that during the war, in a large measure due to scarcity of labour, many of our farmers who ordinarily would be adding to their dairy herd, were in some cases compelled to cut down, and in a few cases, eventually go out of the dairy business entirely because they could not get adequate help to handle their herds. Because of that, we ran into a very great scarcity of butter, and that is something that cannot be remedied overnight; that is something which subsidies cannot remedy, and that is something which, if the dairy industry has to take many more shocks at the present time, will never be remedied in this country, and we will become increasingly more dependent upon other countries for our butter or our butter substitute.

Now, as far as colour is concerned, I think that we are taking too serious a view of the matter altogether. I would suggest, as an illustration, that today we have various brands of cream cheese on the market. We have Kraft cream cheese and we have Philadelphia cream cheese—which I incidentally, like very much.

Philadelphia Cream Cheese is perfectly white and Kraft Cheese is a very deep yellow and never, at any time, have I had any hesitancy regarding the purchase of Philadelphia Cheese, because it was a bit white.

So, because of that, and because of the fact that the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) has stated here he sees no reason why a person cannot go into a drug store and get the colouring and colour it a bit. I think it is a flimsy excuse for anybody fighting this bill, because, after all, we in Canada today—although we may hope to reach that position where we will be an industrial nation rather than an agricultural nation—nevertheless we are very much dependent on our agriculture for our financial well-being, and the dairy farmers of Canada and Ontario have received a very severe blow when that order against the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine was rescinded. However, they have taken that on the

chin and now all they are asking is a little bit of protection in the same way that the consumer is protected against poor quality butter. After all, industry is dependent to a very large extent upon the farmers of this country because if the farmers cannot buy machinery which industry manufactures, industry would not last very long. When we stop to realize that many of the ingredients which go into this substitute for butter are not to be found in any large quantity in Canada, and can never be, we realize we are going out of the country to buy something to compete against an industry which is fighting for its existence in this country.

So, for these reasons, I hope that the Canadian public will realize that we have got to sink or swim together; that the farmer is not trying to bring in something that will hurt his fellow man in the city, but that, together, we can compromise on this in order that our dairy industry may carry on, and I am sure that if this Legislature gives this bill the proper support which I feel it should have, that the dairy industry of this province will do every bit in its power as the years roll by to see to it that good butter is available at a price that is fair and as cheap as they can do it.

For these reasons, I am 100 per cent. behind the bill, as it stands.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (CCF East York): Mr. Speaker, having been a representative in the Federal House of the United Farm Labour Organization in South-east Grey and Grey Bruce, which was predominately agricultural, and now being the representative from York East, in the Provincial House, which is predominately industrial, or, at any rate, urban, I want to say that my chief concern is that we do not make clear the distinction between country people and city people. I think that is extremely important, and much more important actually than the whole subject otherwise. There is a better feeling than there used to be. I want to see it preserved. I want to say that had we had a reasonable price for butter during the war period, I think we would not have run into the scarcity that we encountered. I can recall how H. H. Nannam, president of the Federation of Agriculture, saying if we had—this was early on in the war—the butter price put up to a point where the farmers could really produce that we would have had plenty of butter. I think that is true, and I think we are realizing it.

I want to support what the hon. member for Prince Edward Lennox (Mr. Baxter) has just said. I think there is a great deal about the mental hazard in the colour problem. I do not like soft cheese, but I do like cottage cheese. I like my cheese old and nippy. I do not care whether it is yellow or white so long as it tastes like cheese and not like soap. I do not think my taste is influenced at all by colour, and I think colour is a thing that we are emphasizing too much. It is a mental hazard; it is not a reality. Of course I know that it is hard to persuade our stomachs and our tastes. That is true. I recall one time on board ship an Indian saying that he did not believe in the theory of the Holy Cow but he could not eat beef. It would not stay down. He had been so long in thinking it I think he filled his mind with the thought he could not do it. I know it is important because people have, for so long, eaten butter and the colour is predominantly yellow, but I also know we can change our taste because, before the war I liked everything sweet, but now I do not. I like very little sugar in my coffee, very little sugar in desserts. That is just because simply for years I have been doing it that way.

I think, however, that what was said by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) perfectly expressed my point of view. I certainly believe in the regulations. It is a ridiculous thing that more water is allowed in margarine than in butter. That part we all agree on. But I think the member for West York (Mr. Millard) said that he thought the colour was a little light, and with that I agree.

I intended to tell the House too, about the number of telegrams received. Another one came in. Most of them came C.N.R. I wondered about that. One is CP.R., that makes it an even 180. I think, however, that campaign originated from somebody else than the housewives. I have reason to believe that the housewife or the man of the house did not pay for the telegrams. I think they were paid for either by the merchants or the manufacturers of margarine or by some other unknown source, so I am not unduly alarmed, but I do want people to have a spread within their means. There is one point on that that I think we have not emphasized enough. When butter was selling at 25 cents a pound wages were very much lower than they are today, and when wages are higher butter is dear. So that it really comes to about the same thing, and I think that that ought to be pointed out by someone. I believe with the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) who said that the people who sent these telegrams, for instance, probably did not realize the extent to which they found a market among the farmers of Ontario and many of the things manufactured—certainly things that the farmer's wife is interested in buying—depends very largely on the butter and cream cheques. So the amount of money which the farmers have to spend is all tied up in this question. That may not have been emphasized enough. I think the people who are manufacturing the things the farmers want are concerned with keeping the money coming their way.

Butter was too dear, but at the moment anybody who has raised cows until they are producing milk and then has milked them twice a day—on Sundays as well as other days—and has fed them and kept their quarters clean and sold the cream, separated it and all that, I do not think they think a half a dollar, or sixty cents, is too much for butter.

A thing that puzzles them—because I have been in both places—they say: "City people don't work such long hours. And they do not complain very much when beer goes up, but when farm products go up they make a holler." The city's reaction is that they cannot pay 75 cents for butter. I know they should not; that was very high. One good result for the people who send these telegrams is that butter is very much below 75 cents a pound. It is now within the purchasing power of the person who is now getting much higher wages than when, the price was, say in 1930 when butter was selling for almost nothing. The working people had a worse time trying to buy it then, than they have now. So I am not tremendously impressed by the argument that it costs too much. I do not think, relatively, butter costs any more than in the days of lower wages.

I am going to support the bill, because, I think we have to have the regulations and we may be able to make some changes in committee. I am sure everybody wants today what is the wise thing for both consumer and producer, but, before I sit down, I want to emphasize again that we all must try to prevent a cleavage between the people who live in the country and those who live in the city.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Coming from an urban riding, I just want to say a word. My riding is Ottawa, and I feel just the same as the last speaker (Miss Macphail). There should be no wedge driven between people in the city and people in the country, and I am quite sure a great number in my riding in Ottawa would feel there should be, perhaps, more colour in margarine. There might be some of the farmers out in the country who might feel there should be less, but I am sent here to represent that riding, and I have faith enough in my people there, who know I am going to be just with the farmers, the same as I am with the people who have supported me, and I feel that this bill has a fair provision so far as colour and the regulations are concerned, and I can go back to my people in the City of Ottawa, a 100 per cent. urban riding, and tell them why I voted as I did, and I think they would

agree with me, and send me back again to the House if the margarine question was the only question before them.

MR. J. A. PRINGLE (PC Addington): Mr. Speaker, everyone seems to be in favour of this bill. It does not worry me any. Why not have the vote?

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted for a few minutes to sum up the discussion that has taken place—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) closing the debate? I think perhaps the hon. Minister did not know there is at least one more speaker on the other side and at least one over here.

MR. G. E. PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I am not anxious to prolong the debate. I won't take very much of the time of the House. I just want to say those of us who come from city ridings I think recognize that there has to be, in our economy, a balance between the farmers and industrial workers, and I think that the goal of both farmer and industrial worker is in maintaining some stability between the two of them.

Certainly the issue I think, in this bill, is the issue of regulation, and I think it is a fact that consumers do need protection from the practices of packing corporations in the production of margarine. It is necessary that the quality of the goods that are sold, quality of the margarine that is sold, shall be such that it will be nutritious and healthful, and I think we have every reason to expect that the regulations to be issued will, in fact, protect the consuming public and those persons buying margarine should know what they are getting is in fact, a good product. I have been told by packing-house workers that the cost of producing margarine at the present time—I think they know what they are talking about—is actually less than the cost of producing shortening, and that the packing corporations are making a bigger profit from the handling of margarine, by far, than they receive in the handling of butter.

I am not too dismayed by the 160 or 170 telegrams and letters I received on this issue. I think there is a feeling among city consumers that they want the colour of the product that they receive, to be such that it will be edible, will appear edible to them in any event.

There is another point I think in this campaign that we have had, that grocers at the moment are being allowed by the packers a larger margin than they have been getting on butter. I want to say right here in answer to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) that the question before us here is not one of subsidy at this time.

The question that is before us is a question of regulation, the principle of whether or not this product ought to be regulated, and I think what we are voting on is the question, "Are you for regulations, or are you not? Are you in favour of regulating the product for the protection of the consumer and for the protection of the farmers, or are you voting to give the packing industry a free hand to do what they want?" If that is the issue, I am all for voting for regulations. It has been indicated by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) that we in this group have some reservations with respect to some of the details of the bill. These reservations will become quite clear when the matter comes to committee, but on the principle of voting for regulations, certainly I will vote for the bill.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, to keep the question of what is relevant on this bill strictly in order, I do not know that I could bring myself to agree entirely with the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park). It seems perfectly obvious to me that the Provincial Government of the Province of Ontario is not in a position to pay a sufficiently large subsidy on all the butter which is produced in Ontario, to bring the price down sufficiently low,

because if they did, there would be no practical reason to have this bill before this House. That is why I was not prepared to take any point of order to clear that discussion. Just to indicate what it would mean when one is advocating a "subsidy." I understand the production in Ontario last year was about 300,000,000 pounds. With a subsidy of 25 cents a pound to accomplish the object in that way, would cost the province a little trifle of $75,000,000, which is a very large proportion of the present budget of the Province of Ontario. So I think it might be more useful to bring that subsidy question into proportion in relation to the provincial expenditures.

There is one point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize. I have here an issue of the *Toronto Daily Star,* in which they find the fact that "1,500 wires rapped the margarine bill," and I do think it is great satisfaction to all of us who are on the government side, to find that this bill has been so well received by the House, and that irrespective of what political group each of us belongs, there seems to be a very favourable reception to the general principle of the bill, which leaves the *Toronto Star* in a position of almost dignified isolation on that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And the *Globe and Mail.*

MR. BLACKWELL: That may be. I was particularly impressed with a remark made by the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) and the remarks of the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) in which they emphasized, in relation to this bill, exactly the attitude which pervaded the executive council and the government supporters in the difficult task of meeting in any satisfactory way this highly controversial problem. Our attitude could not have been better expressed than it was expressed by both those two hon. members when they indicated in what they said that our task here in the Legislature was to attempt to do a job in the public interest, which would give us, as far as possible on such a controversial question, some measure of reasonable satisfaction to both the farmers and the urban dwellers. It is a gratification to all of us here—as I am sure it is to every hon. member in the Legislature—that we feel its broad principle is coming close to accomplishing that result.

May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to make a personal reference to the wires I have received. These wires followed the publication of an anonymous advertisement which expressed itself to be on behalf of the margarine manufacturers.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, may I say that in promoting a public campaign, I do not like anonymity. People should come out from behind the hedges and say who they are, when they are undertaking that kind of promotion.

The second thing they should do is to place the issue clearly and fairly before those whom they invite to protest. That was not done. The general intent of the advertisement was the choice in this bill between a flat, white, messy-looking substance, or a yellow colour. That was not the case. Therefore, my attitude is in relation to some 400 wires which came to me in that way, that they were of no value. I say that in this Legislature deliberately, those wires were of no value.

May I, on the contrary, say that during the time this matter was under discussion, I received a considerable number of letters expressing a variety of points of view, not only from constituents in my own constituency, but elsewhere. And I do want to say to those people who have gone to the trouble and taken the time to sit down and express their personal views, they were rendering a public service. I have read all the communications received, as I am sure every hon. member of this Legislature has done. and I am sure many of those communications we received from constituents and others at one time or another, helped our thinking in connection with this problem. We give every consideration to communications of those who take the time and

trouble to express their views on a public issue, to which they have given personal thought.

The purpose I thought I might mainly serve in saying a few words about this bill, was that it might be something about the legal background behind it. I would say to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that the opinion of the Department of the Attorney-General of Ontario was that jurisdiction to deal with the question of margarine which had been vested for over fifty years in the Government of Canada, was properly there, and it was our opinion then, and still is, that if the case goes to the Privy Council, the judgment might well be reversed. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) shares that view with me.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The Supreme Court decision was very mixed up.

MR. BLACKWELL: I am sure that all lawyers who have studied the judgment, feel that it may well be reversed. And may I say to the hon. members of this House, that the reason the Government of Ontario did not appear on that reference was that our function, if we had gone there, would have been to oppose the continuance of that jurisdiction in the dominion. We felt, in the first place, it was properly there legally, and we felt, in the second place, that practically it should be there, so we did not argue that this was a provincial matter.

I am sure every hon. member of this Legislature knows what is behind the margarine problem. There was a problem there in the bringing into Canada of Newfoundland, where margarine had been manufactured, sold and consumed for a great length of time, and it seemed perfectly necessary if that federation was to be completed, that the prohibition of the sale of margarine which would then be effective on Newfoundland, must be removed.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, with all seriousness in this House, that to refer that to the Supreme Court in the way it was done, with a decision coming down when no legislature was sitting, was a total and complete failure of responsible government in this country —a failure to face an issue.

Under those circumstances, I want to suggest to this House, that as far as the protection of the dairy industry in Ontario or the rest of Canada is concerned, if there is a case there, it can still be dealt with by the Government of Canada, by reason of its powers through protective tariffs to give some protection on the importation of oils under proper circumstances, such as has been given to industry in this country by protective tariffs.

My own view is that there is—even if I am representing an urban constituency—some equity in the feeling of many farmers that there are so many products they have to buy where the price is affected by protection, while they themselves in their own industry are receiving no protection of a like kind.

That is a problem which the Dominion Government has jurisdiction to deal with, and it should be made clear in this Legislature that that is the proper place to deal with that problem.

It also follows that under the Pure Food Act of Canada, the Parliament of Canada had jurisdiction to deal with the question of margarine or regulations, unless this country is to be Balkanized on that particular subject, and that is where it should be done.

As a matter of fact, in considering what our responsibilities were here, we naturally examined the Pure Food Act, and any possible regulations which might be used in that Act, just as the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) took time out to travel through different states of the United States, to examine this problem, and to find out how it was dealt with there first-hand, and, as a matter of fact, we collected, as far as we could, the legislation in effect, not only in the United States, but elsewhere, and when we saw how limited were the possible provisions of the Pure Food Act, and the apparent lack of intention to deal with this, either by way of protection, or by way of Pure Food laws, this government de-

cided that to the extent it had constitutional power to act in the matter, it was not proper to follow one evasion of responsibility by another evasion of responsibility, and we decided we would face up to the issue, and may I say to the hon. member for Prince-Edward-Lennox (Mr. Baxter) that he really did not think of it first; it was in the Speech from the Throne.

I want to say in conclusion, it is a matter of pride to me to find myself today in a government in which both the government and its supporters are prepared to face the issue on a controversial question.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes available —and I promise you I will be very brief—may I say that I think the field has been pretty well covered indeed this afternoon. It is a great deal of gratification to me to find so much agreement on the principle of this bill, and the regulations which it is proposed to establish in the bill. Coming from a constituency, as I do, it puzzles me why a great many other hon. members have received so many letters and telegrams, and so on. I would not like to think that my constituents think I am so stubborn I would not pay any attention to any representations that they made. I would rather like to feel that they have sufficient confidence in me—in any event, I have not received a letter or a telegram.

MR. SALSBERG: You should divide up with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). He got 400.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I feel the hon. members of this House should consider very seriously the point brought out by the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail), because it refers to one thing we had very much in mind in drafting this bill, and that was, if possible, to avoid in any way creating any cleavage which might arise between the consumers and producers of this important product.

I think a great deal of credit is due to the farm organizations of this province for the fairness in which they have faced up to the issue, and the representations they have made to the government in respect to what they felt should be done by way of regulations in regard to this product which, as they say, endangers the whole dairy industry.

It is unfortunate, but I feel there has been a great deal of misrepresentation in the form which was printed in the press over the week-end, sponsored by some special interests, who have a certain interest other than possibly what we had in mind in drafting the bill, and that they would put out a form of that kind—which not only misrepresented the facts as they are contained in the bill, but also led the public into an unnecessary state of mind over the whole affair—was indeed most unfortunate.

May I say again that I am pleased at the fair-minded attitude which was assumed by the hon. members of all groups in this House in dealing with this controversial question this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is for second reading of Bill No. 158, "An Act respecting Oleomargarine."

Call in the members.

The House divided.

Motion agreed to on division.

AYES: 79
NAYS: 2

Second reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6 of the clock, I do now leave the chair.

It being 6 of the clock p.m., the House took recess.

The House resumes at 8.00 o'clock.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 39th Order.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 39th Order; second reading of Bill No. 162, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act," Mr. Daley.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 162, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. G. E. PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Is the hon. Minister going to elucidate?

HON. MR. DALEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think, as I outlined this bill rather completely in the introduction of it, I might well be a little more brief in my remarks this evening.

Section 1 of the bill provides that this provision which prescribes the amount of compensation payable in death cases where the dependents are other than the widow or children of deceased workmen is amended by adding a stated maximum. It was felt desirable to have a fixed maximum to take care of this particular kind of case; while it happens in very few cases, there are occasions when the board must use some discretion in establishing what is the proper amount to be paid, and it was felt, to give the board some protection in this, that the maximum should be fixed.

Another section endeavours to clear up a case where under the minimum prescribed in the event of a permanent disability—you will recall that we amended the Act two years ago to establish a minimum of one hundred dollars and even though a man made less than one hundred dollars, for a permanent disability he now gets a minimum of $100. A little difficulty was encountered in some cases and some people seemed to feel that that minimum was the maximum, but that is not so, and this Act endeavours to clear that matter up.

It also authorizes the board in a case where additional payments have been made to children over the age of sixteen, under certain conditions the board have authority now to continue payment for children until the age of eighteen in those cases where it seems desirable because of the natural ability of the child to absorb education and that it seems desirable that the child continue in school.

The board can now continue payments up to the age of eighteen. But then we run into a minor difficulty with that.

In some instances a child on reaching the age of eighteen was in the middle of a school term and it was apparent, in some cases, that were payments cut off in the middle of the term, or at any time during the term, that that child lost the amount of time that he or she had put in on that particular term.

The board are seeking, under this bill, to get authority to continue payments after eighteen to the end of the term.

This bill also increases the rate of compensation from 66⅔ per cent. to 75 per cent. I do not think I need to devote much additional time in explaining that, Mr. Speaker. It has been well discussed in the House and there seemed to be general approval for that increase. In fact, there was a bill that would raise the percentage to 100 per cent., and while the government felt they could not go that far, they felt, after considering the matter from all angles, that a rate of 75 per cent. could be justified.

It also increases the maximum for which compensation can be paid up to $3,000, changing the figure from $2,500 to $3,000. This Act was changed some years ago from $2,000, at which figure it had stood for a great many years, to $2,500. In view of the changing conditions, the increase in salaries that have taken place over the years and the fact that a goodly number of people now earn at least $3,000 or possibly more, it was felt desirable to raise the maximum from $2,500 to $3,000.

I believe that covers the pertinent things that this Act hopes to accomplish. I now move second reading.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) can be assured that this bill will receive general support, although there will be regret from this side of the House that he has not gone somewhat further in the provisions which he has announced this evening.

I do particularly want to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that he con-

sider the question of the application of the 75 per cent. figure to those who are presently on compensation.

The Act provides that Section 3 of the bill shall not come into effect until January, 1950, I believe, or Section 5, and shall only apply to accidents happening on or after that date. You have the situation if a man is injured between Christmas and New Year's, he gets 66⅔ per cent. compensation and if he is injured on January 1st or subsequently, he gets 75 per cent. compensation. He should arrange, as the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) suggests, he should arrange to put off accidents until after the first of January.

I understand there have been over the years increases from 55 per cent. to 66⅔ per cent. as it is now. Now we are proposing that it should be 75 per cent. in this particular bill.

The problem that arises is this, that those persons who are on compensation and a good many of them who were injured during the days when wages were not as high as they are at the present time, are compelled to live on 55 per cent. or 66⅔ per cent. of the lower wage rates prevailing a few years ago, and their problem is more difficult than the person who gets a percentage of his present rate of pay. I believe, if we are going to accept the principle of 75 per cent., we must accept it all the way through.

It seems to me the reserves of the board—I understand they have $80,000,000 invested—would be sufficient to pay 75 per cent. across the board applying to those previously on compensation and continually on compensation, as well as those who may in the future need compensation. There are always going to be those who are permanently injured as the result of an accident, but because their accident happened to occur before the government was prepared to accept the principle there should be a higher percentage payment, who are going to suffer as a consequence. That, more than anything else, is the criticism I would like to level at this bill.

We have indicated our desire that it should be raised to 100 per cent. As the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) said, such a measure was brought down and disposed of in this House a few days ago.

There is one other matter on this raising of the maximum from $2,500 to $3,000 that is provided in this bill. I think the government has failed to go far enough to meet the position, particularly in the case of highly skilled workers in industry; because of the inflationary condition, highly skilled workers in industry, a good many of them, are getting $3,500 or thereabouts, and I think, to be more realistic, to bring the maximum for industry up to the figure that is the actual maximum in industry today, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) ought to have brought down a bill at least providing for a $3,500 maximum figure at this time.

We have already debated the issue previously—

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I just want to point out to the hon. member (Mr. Park) that matter has been disposed of and we cannot discuss an increase in the maximum because, I believe, that bill was voted down and, according to the rules, once it has been disposed of, that ends it.

MR. PARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to assure the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that we on this side of the House will support the bill in its present form, but we will have certain suggestions in committee stage about some of the other provisions.

Although we do not think it goes far enough, we congratulate the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) in taking this step forward.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). Section 2 of this bill, does that apply to parents of an injured workman?

HON. MR. DALEY: Yes, it would.

MR. SALSBERG: Thank you.

HON. MR. DALEY: It might be a brother, if that brother were a dependent.

MR. SALSBERG: As Mr. Speaker has stated before, many of the principles of the bill have been dealt with in other measures that were before us, and there is no use repeating.

I believe the bill is a step forward and it has broadened and widened the activities of the Compensation Board, and to that extent it is welcomed by everybody.

On this Section 2, on this question of parents, I think we should not restrict the amounts to be paid to a father or a mother whose sole support, a son, for instance, was killed in an industrial accident. I am afraid that this section will create that restriction, or, perhaps I should say, continue the restriction.

I was made to understand some little while ago there was actually no provision in the Act for payments to be made to parents, and although the board took a very liberal view of such cases and actually granted compensation to mothers and fathers where it was proven that the son was the sole supporter of the parents, nevertheless, I understand that was as a result of very much leeway that the board took. If that is so, then perhaps there should be necessary amendments in the bill to make it absolutely legal and proper.

I think we should not restrict the amount paid to a mother. I had a case a few months ago where a son was killed in an industrial accident. He was the sole support of his mother who had a little establishment of her own, and occupied a dwelling. I do not see any justification for treating the mother left behind in a different manner than we would a wife or child in relation to the case I just spoke of, a mother who had no other means of support. Her son was the only means of support and his death removed all sources of income. If Section 2 applies to mothers in that category, then I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that he give it some thought and, perhaps while it is in committee stage, bring in an amendment that will do away with that restriction and make it possible to pay a mother the full amount that would go to a wife or any other member of the family.

MR. DALEY: This permits more than would go to a wife, this permits up to $100 if the situation were such—there would have to be more than one dependent to get that, but a wife would get $50.

MR. SALSBERG: If she was alone.

MR. DALEY: Yes, and according to the number of children but I think the Act is all right as is. I will have a further talk with the board on that particular question. I think we should be frank and not be kidding ourselves about these things, Mr. Speaker, and I do not see there is any possibility of making these payments retroactive, to go back over the years, 20 or 25 years.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I did not make myself clear. I did not mean for those who had received payment in the past but rather in regard to those who may be on compensation over a long period, those who are on compensation and may have to be on compensation.

MR. DALEY: You have to have a date. You have to decide whether you stand still or go forward. Now it is impossible to bring it in because of our assessments being made already and it would be a physical impossibility.

MR. PARK: On the day the Act would be proclaimed.

MR. DALEY: You cannot put a retroactive feature into this Workmen's Compensation, Mr. Speaker, because there are actuarial requirements that have to be made. I think this House will agree that this government has, year by year, carefully endeavoured to bring the compensation along as fast as it could up to a point where we think it eventually should be. I hope the hon. members of this House will accept this.

It might not give you everything we would like it to but certainly it is a step forward.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (L Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I think the House generally agrees with this measure, that it is a move in the right direction and it gives additional benefits to those who fall within the compensation law. I am particularly impressed by the two clauses, one which raises the base to $3,000, and the other which increases the maximum from 66⅔ per cent. to 75 per cent. And, now it may be said that this does not go as far as some of us would like it to go but it is unquestionably a step in the right direction. I would remind the House that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) was talking about moving along the line by making these changes as public opinion seemed to demand it and so on, that last year in this House the Liberal group moved a bill in the House which would increase the Workmen's Compensation from 66⅔ per cent to 75 per cent.

MR. DALEY: But you sat here 9 years and never made an amendment.

MR. OLIVER: We are making progress, all right. You have been here quite a while too. We again introduced the same bill again this year. I do not mind seeing our bill going down in defeat when I know the germ of reform had been securely and firmly planted in the minds of my hon. friends opposite, who made use of the suggestion in the bill that is now before us. We are only too glad at any time to move somewhat ahead of the government in order that they can turn their legislation on these matters in that progressive way. We hope when we come to the bill which extends holidays to two weeks that the government will take under advisement the advisability of bringing in a bill along that line also.

MR. DALEY: Getting on the wagon, eh?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 40th Order.

ADOPTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 40th Order, second reading of Bill No. 163, "An Act to amend the Adoption Act," Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 163, "An Act to amend the Adoption Act,"

There is very little involved in the amendment to this Act. From time to time since I have become Minister of the Department, for some reason or other there was included in the present bill, or the former bill, provision whereby the Minister, it was only necessary for the Minister to act on matters of adoption in connection with a person being adopted over 25 years of age or the applicant was 21 years older than the person being adopted. I have on one or two occasions found myself in an embarrassing position. I do not feel that I should sit on the merits of the adoption, that is the performance of the adoption. That is the amendment that now, under adoptions under the provisions of the new amendment adoption can be referred to the Court in fairness to those concerned.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 41st Order.

FARM PRODUCTS GRADES AND SALES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 41st Order; second reading of Bill No. 164, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Grades and Sales Act," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. WILLIAM A. GOODFELLOW (PC Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 164, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Grades and Sales Act."

MR. T. H. ISLEY (CCF Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, would the hon.

Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) explain, please?

MR. GOODFELLOW: The purpose of this amendment to the Act is to bring the Dominion Hog and Wool Grading regulations into effect, although it has been carried on in practice for some years it has been found that the Dominion Hog and Wool Grading regulations could not be brought into this Act. It was found that the wool growers and graders in the province are particularly anxious to have this improvement, and these regulations will be put into effect in this Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 42nd Order.

DEPARTMENT OF TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 42nd Order; second reading of Bill 165, "An Act to amend the Department of Travel and Publicity Act, 1946," Mr. Cecile.

HON. LOUIS P. CECILE (PC Minister of Travel and Publicity): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 165, "An Act to amend the Department of Travel and Publicity Act, 1946."

As I explained on first reading of this bill, Section 1 is simply added to bring the practice with respect to the annual report of the Department of Travel and Publicity into line with the uniform practice of the Provincial Secretary.

The next important section of this bill is aimed at curbing the practice whereby tourist information has been displayed by persons quite unqualified to give the information in the province. Such signs have been displayed by taxi-stands, small retail stores and so on more as a matter of attracting customers than giving out information, and we have found that in some cases they are giving misleading information to American tourists. Then there is the section that is of interest to the tourist trade and that is the amendment to the effect of a sign indicating whether a place is open or closed. We have received quite a few complaints that some tourist may go into some place where there is a tourist sign saying, "Open" and they have gone along to the place and found it either closed or not ready for operation and this relieves that particular inconvenience.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I want to say not only that this is a very good bill but a very necessary bill as well. I am referring to the last statement of the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) about the "closed" signs or "no vacancy" signs. We in Niagara Falls have trouble about that being the most outstanding tourist centre in the province, handling more tourists than anyone else. We have found that tourist home operators are prone to put out a sign saying, "No Vacancy," or "Closed," because they have more or less encouraged a bootlegging system as far as tourists are concerned. If they put these "No Vacancy" signs the people do not stop but if the sign is not put up the people drop in and are sent to another tourist home where there is a set-up and the first tourist home is given 25c or 50c a head for providing the second tourist home with customers. I have complaints every day in the tourist season about that. We have the same trouble with taxi drivers. Perhaps a tourist centre will say, "We will send you to such and such," and the taxi driver will ask them where they are going and when he has been told, he will tell them, "I will take you to a better place." Of course, the place he takes them to gives him 25c or 50c a head. I am hoping this section will curb this to some extent. I think it is a good bill and if we can do away with this bootlegging business as far as the tourists are concerned, it is a step in the right direction.

I want to compliment the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) on this bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): 43rd Order.

TOURIST ESTABLISHMENTS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 43rd Order; second reading of Bill No. 166, "An Act respecting Tourist Establishments," Mr. Cecile.

HON. LOUIS P. CECILE (PC Minister of Travel and Publicity): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 166, "An Act respecting Tourist Establishments."

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, is the Minister going to explain?

MR. L. E. WISMER (CCF Riverdale): We should not have to ask the Minister (Mr. Cecile) to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, yes. The motion is put and if the hon. member wishes to ask questions—

MR. WISMER: Second reading is not a time for asking questions, it is a time for criticising the bill on its principle and at no time has the principle been brought into it.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a time for it and if the hon. members are not prepared to rise to their feet—

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I point out this difficulty? When the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) moves a bill on second reading he has the floor and if he wishes to can give reasons for it. As a matter of fact he should do it and he would do it in any legislative body that is half grown up. If he remains silent, the opposition hon. members who might wish to speak on the bill and yet defer to him are in a position where the bill is called and they have lost the opportunity to speak. Now, I think it is hardly fair for the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) to remain seated when an hon. member wishes to speak and he certainly has priority if he wishes to make a speech.

MR. CECILE: Mr. Speaker, I have a few notes on this bill and I would be glad to give them as a matter of information. This Act, as I said in first reading, changes the name of the former Act and widens the scope of the Act. As the hon. members know the Department of Travel and Publicity was formed to develop the tourist industry in Ontario by encouraging and permitting accommodation facilities for tourists. The Tourist Camp Regulation Act, 1946, gave sanction to the regulation of one type of tourist establishment only. It is considered that this sanction should be widened in equity and for other considerations and it is proposed to bring under licence and inspection every type of establishment offering accommodation to the travelling public, except establishments licensed for liquor. It is considered to allow a tourist home or guest house; an hotel, unless licenced to sell beer; and a tourist camp to accommodate tourists, each accommodating the same number of guests and doing the same type of business in competition to be operating side by side with only the last-named under provincial licence.

The title "tourist camp" over their name has proved rather unpopular with the operators of establishments of the best type. It is considered as undesirable in its misleading association. In its place, the blanket title "tourist establishment" is proposed, with other titles designating the various categories.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is a result of all the tourist conferences we have had throughout the past year. Furthermore, it was through information received from different tourist bodies and those who run these tourist camps, from the report we have received through our inspectors, of different groups who are interested in this provision.

The whole gist of it is really widening the scope of it, taking in everybody who is in the tourist business, which is considered as such in the province.

MR. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I think the bill is an excellent one. I am particularly impressed with the long list of powers set out in Section 2 of the bill respecting regulations which may be made by the

Lieutenant-Governor in council. I am going to suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) a place where he might give some consideration and where I think the tourist industry of this province could be materially improved if he were to take action.

I am thinking of such tourist attractions as Wasaga Beach, for example, which during the summer months brings literally thousands to that area, and which is badly in need of regulation. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) might consider under this provision of the Act the possibilities of seeing that there is developed in that area something like the parks arrangement which they have so successfully developed and which are such a tourist attraction in the Niagara region.

It seems to me that up there commercialization has destroyed completely, or almost completely, a natural beauty spot and a natural attraction for tourists, and I dare say other hon. members will be able to suggest other areas where there is need for that kind of regulation and that kind of planned development. It may be the Wasaga Beach development is too far advanced to call a halt to the commercialization which has developed up there to the point where it has almost destroyed a tourist attraction, but I am very pleased to see this bill brought forward, particularly am I pleased, as I say, to see the regulations which give such wide powers to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

I hope they will act upon them to preserve some of the tourist centres which are being destroyed at the present time through excessive commercialization.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Department of Mines, page 74.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): You are not going to make an orphan out of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Porter), are you?

MR. FROST: Well, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Porter) is missing, so—

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): We were in the midst of the Department of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Porter).

MR. FROST: I beg your pardon?

MR. SALSBERG: Were we not in the midst of the Provincial Secretary's Estimates?

MR. FROST: That is right, but I am going to take the Secretary's Estimates just as soon as he returns.

MR. SALSBERG: All right.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I might just make a few remarks in introducing these Estimates. I will not be as expansive as I might have been if it had not been for the fact the Mines Committee was set up at the commencement of this session of the Legislature. I think a number of hon. members, at least those hon. members who were able to attend that committee, have had an opportunity of seeing certain things in relation to the Department of Mines, and I am hopeful as time goes along they will have more opportunity in that regard and that the experts of the Department of Mines themselves will be able to tell hon. members who are interested of many things relating to that very important and interesting department.

As I said at the opening meeting of the committee, there are so many phases of mining it is quite impossible for one man to know all about it. I think the Deputy Minister of Mines (Mr. Rickaby) is as expert a man in the matter of mining as we have in Ontario, but I know he would not go so far as to

say that he began to know everything about this tremendous subject and its very, very interesting phases.

I might say to hon. members of the House that we have one or two broadcasts that were available and in at least one of them, time for the Minister of Mines to speak on the free time given over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. We felt this, that speaking for fifteen minutes on a subject by one person perhaps was not too attractive to the people. We had the feeling perhaps people were not listening to broadcasts of that sort, so we tried an innovation, and at the beginning of January we put on a broadcast in which we took two men connected with the Department of Mines and had them join in the broadcast and tell, first-hand, something of the work they were doing. Subsequently we had a lot of comments about that, so here at the beginning of this month, we had another free period and we put on at that time the provincial geologist, Dr. Hearst, and also put on a practical prospector, Mr. "Jock" Macfarlane, so that these gentlemen, who are experts in their own line, could tell in their own words and with their own voice something of what they were doing, without having it retailed by a second person who obviously could not be an expert in these things as these gentlemen are.

Mr. Chairman, in that second broadcast, which was during the time of the prospectors' meeting here in Toronto, we had a very large number of interested inquiries relative to that subject, and we may develop that further.

I would say in the mining industry one of the great needs of that industry is understanding on the part of the public. The fact of the matter is that those of us who have spent our lives in Southern Ontario have not had much opportunity to learn something about the needs and the possibilities of that very great industry, an industry which has a tremendous bearing upon the economic well-being of this province.

The production of our mines in Ontario is running now something over a $250,000,000 in new wealth each year. That places mining quite high up on the list of really basic industry in the Province of Ontario.

I know, Mr. Chairman, as you look at the Estimates of the Department of Mines, you see the total Estimates $846,000 for an industry which is really a $250,000,000 industry each year. I would not want you to think that represents everything in connection with the mining industry, because, as I pointed out to the House on previous occasions, development roads, for instance, come under the Department of Highways, and the work which is done there in developmental matters is reflected in the Department of Highways.

Take, for instance, developments in schools, that is reflected in the tremendous amounts of money which are expended by the Department of Education. Then we have other matters that the Mining Department is interested in; take, for instance, the problems we have arising out of mining municipalities. I can say to hon. members of the House that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) and myself have spent countless hours in dealing with that very difficult problem, and we know that, while there are still complaints from the northern area, nevertheless, we have substantially met the difficulties of those areas. We have stabilized their revenues, we have provided a very much more adequate revenue for them, and we have endeavoured to meet the problems of those places, which are quite unlike the municipalities here in Southern Ontario. They have grown up in a different way. Their existence is pretty well tied up with the mining industry; if the mining industry fails, then those places fail, and having regard to all those things we have endeavoured to meet their problems in a practical, reasonable, common-sense way. While I cannot give you the figures from memory, the amounts we are giving to the mining municipalities now are in the tens of thousands, and yes, in the hundreds of thousands of dollars more than was the case a few years ago.

With that explanation as regards the amount, which certainly does not reflect

what is being done in the mining industry, I may say these Estimates relate largely to the scientific end of things, and even in the scientific end of things, they do not cover the whole picture.

In the Department of Planning and Development, for instance, there are researches being conducted under the Research Council, relative to the use of iron ores and other industrial metals.

One of the very important and very interesting branches of this department is the Geological Branch, something I am unable to speak to you with any authority on, because I am not a geologist. When the geologists tell me what happened in the beginnings of the world I almost always disagree with them, but they tell me I am wrong; therefore there is not very much I can say, other than to give you some indication of the work that is being undertaken.

In Eastern Ontario, for instance, we are undertaking a very interesting work there in the matter of survey of iron ores and industrial metals, in collaboration with the Department of Mines at Ottawa, whom, I may say, Mr. Chairman, were a little tardy with their support. We have been conducting magnatometer surveys down in that country, with the idea of reviving—I was going to say "the ancient" iron ore ranges which have been known down there since the opening up of Ontario 100 years ago.

I mentioned to this House on a previous occasion that during the American Civil War some of the iron for General Grant's guns, the northern army guns in that war of some 80 odd years ago, came from Eastern Ontario.

Those iron ore ranges may stretch over as far as the Parry Sound district. During the last year and this coming year we plan to engage in surveys running up about as far as the eastern boundary of Haliburton County, and it may be—in fact, I have no doubt it will—that Peterborough and Lindsay will be great iron ore centres like Pittsburg.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: However, that is in the future. I would say that depends upon the survey, upon the success of these magnatometer surveys where, by means of airplanes, airborne instruments indicate formations in the earth which indicate to geologists on the ground that they should go to that place and there, in conjunction with mapping operations which are being undertaken by our department and the department at Ottawa, perhaps something very real may develop.

In the Kirkland Lake-Larder Lake district, and in that part running from Kirkland east, Dr. Thompson has been engaged in a very important work, and I think he has completed his survey of that belt and that it will be of immense value to the operators in that district.

You know, ofttimes in countries where it appears that perhaps every bit of it has been traversed and re-traversed, by means of scientific instruments and modern methods, new mines have been brought into being in places where it was thought there was nothing further to be investigated.

In Southern Ontario—to jump from the Kirkland Lake Belt and come to Southern Ontario—we have the work Dr. Watt is doing in connection with water tables and the matter of ground water control, an immensely interesting and important subject which, perhaps, is not so closely connected with the Department of Mines, but more closely connected with agriculture. Nevertheless, the Department of Mines have been doing that work, because of the facilities they have for doing it.

To jump now from Southern Ontario, we go to the Cobalt area. I remember when I first became Minister of Mines some 6 years ago, everybody assured me with the utmost confidence that Cobalt was "all through," and they were going to close the place up. The fact of the matter is, that at that time they wanted us to embark on what was some sort of semi-relief project there, to try to keep things going for awhile until the prospectors from that area could re-establish themselves some place else. I think that has gone by, and I think there

are great possibilities in the Cobalt area. We have there Dr. Robert Thompson, our resident geologist, who will, I think, in perhaps a comparatively short time be able to produce geological data which will once more interest not only the prospectors in that area, but people who can see that there is a real possibility in the Cobalt district.

We must remember this, that in these days Cobalt ore itself is of immense value in the matter of the iron ore industry, and with the up-surge of iron ore in the Province of Ontario—the Steeprock developments, the developments up in Algoma, and, as I say, the very important developments we hope to have in Eastern Ontario—that Cobalt is going to be of more value.

Then, we had the unfortunate death of Dr. Horwood, the geologist at the Lakehead, at Port Arthur this last year. He was in the midst of a report in connection with that very interesting area in the Long Lac-Beardmore area, which we are now, since his untimely death, reorganizing with a view to completing that.

Mr. Chairman, I think that gives hon. members an outline of some of the more important developments. We have, of course, the important finds of uranium in the Superior District and the emphasis perhaps that we have put on those very important constructions. I may say uranium has been evidenced elsewhere in Ontario. Those in the Haliburton area have perhaps not been too great to date, nevertheless in the Algoma area, in the Lake Superior District, there are very fine possibilities of uranium development.

This department is an immense department, dealing, for instance, with oil and natural gas in southwestern Ontario. I will not tell hon. members anything about the problems which are connected with that area, because they have been pretty well publicized in the last couple of years. However, I am bound to say—it is sometimes nice to do a bit of boasting—a year ago we had 25,000 people out of work down there, and we were able, by means of reorganization and obtaining teamwork between the developing companies, between the producers of artificial gas, labour, the municipalities and others—we have been able this year to completely overcome the difficulty and, while our friends in hydro, who are always so good, have had difficulties, we have not had any difficulties at all.

There are interesting possibilities in the James Bay District in connection with drilling for oil. Just what that might produce, one cannot say.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): I wish you would find some oil.

MR. FROST: I beg your pardon?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I wish you would find some oil in Ontario.

MR. FROST: Well, we would like to find it ourselves, and we are endeavouring to do it. We have been doing some drilling ourselves in that James Bay District and it may amount to something. We had $30,000 I think, last year, in the Estimates for that purpose, and it may be perhaps we should take some of the larger companies and any other concessions up there with a view to letting them spend a lot of money, the same as they are doing out in Alberta, with a view to perhaps developing another great field in Canada.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (LP Bellwoods): We will be able to get it out of margarine. There is lots of oil there.

MR. FROST: Yes, but that is whale oil, they tell me.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, arising out of the hon. Minister's (Mr. Frost) remarks which he made with reference to a radio broadcast some little time ago—in fact, I was under the impression there was more than one broadcast.

MR. FROST: Two; one in January and one in March.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In which two of the valued officials of the department took part, and I believe in at least one the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) also took part.

MR. FROST: Yes, both of them, in fact.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have no objection, of course, to the servants of this province, particularly men of such eminence and ability, going on the air to inform the public—

MR. FROST: They were strictly non-political.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) says they were "strictly non-political," but the difficulty is that that particular series of broadcasts were expressly stated to be broadcasts to enable the various political parties of the province to put their views before the people.

MR. MACLEOD: All except us.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Last year, I believe the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) also participated in that series. The Provincial Affairs series have always been heard on that basis. There have been, however, other broadcasts on an entirely different basis, in which public servants, like Mr. Saunders, the Chairman of the Hydro Commission, have gone on the air and spoken to the people of the province. The series in which he took part was not supposed to be a political series, notwithstanding the opinion of some of the people as to their inspiration, but the Provincial Affairs series is on exactly the same footing as the Nation's Business series, which is on a federal network. It is supposed to be free time provided by the C.B.C. for the expression of the points of view of the various political parties through their spokesmen and representatives. I know the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would not suggest for a moment that the two gentlemen who spoke from the Department of Mines were authorized spokesmen of the Progressive Conservative Party. I think it is a very good thing for them to speak over a network, but I think it could have been arranged for another occasion.

I do not think it is good business for civil servants to take part in such a series. I am not quarrelling with what they said, but, after all, unless the usual procedure was departed from in those two instances, the announcer both at the beginning and the end of the broadcast, would say that these people were the spokesmen for the political party for which time was allotted. I do not think it is quite fair to the civil servants, and I do not think it is fair for the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) to allow them to attend, and I would, in a friendly spirit, ask that it be not done again. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) or some of the spokesmen for the Progressive Conservative Party should take that time, and should not mix in together the work of the civil service and the pronouncements of the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost). I think the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will agree with me—

MR. FROST: I do not know whether I will or not.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why not?

MR. FROST: We had this time allotted and available to the Department—

MR. JOLLIFFE: To your Party.

MR. FROST: That is right. Why should we not go on and actually speak of what concerned interesting matters arising out of the Department of Mines? It seems to me that you can carry these things to a point where nobody listens to them. We have received complaints from the miners themselves. We have had prospectors who said "Can you not do something which will get people to listen to information about the Department of Mines, and learn something about it?" To be perfectly frank, in a highly technical department of that sort, you take a person who stands up and gives a second-hand talk on scientific matters, and people just will not listen. We went to great care in that matter, to make it

interesting for the people, so that they would know something about what is going on. I would say that of the 4,500,000 people in this province, I imagine there are over 4,000,000 of them who never saw a prospector, has no idea what he looks like, nor what he does. We had Mr. McFarlane, and we hoped to get some of our actual bush investigators to tell something about their work, how they operate, how they staked, and how they inspect, to make these broadcasts something of an educational nature rather than just merely the retailing of a lot of things which people will obviously say were second-hand. There was an attempt to rather dramatize what was being done in the mines.

Let me give you an example. We are opening a rescue station in the Timmins area; in fact, perhaps it is in operation now. What could be more interesting than to have people hear what is being done in connection with mine-rescue work, so they will know what is being done in this department, and they will then know it is not simply a matter of "window dressing," but something which actually counts.

Then there is the matter of road testing. That is a tremendously important subject. What would be more interesting than for people to hear a description from, for instance, Dean Young on what is taking place there? The people will then know these things that are being done, and that it is something which adds to the safety of our workmen, and will get away from the terrific situation we had in connection with the Paymaster disaster a few years ago.

I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) that we have had a lot of comments about these things, and there are a great number of people interested in them, and we have been wondering if we should not go further, and take some time ourselves on the air and have a broadcast, say, once a month until the end of the year covering a lot of the subjects on which people are asking for information. I cannot imagine anything in Canadian affairs or provincial affairs which would be more interesting. We think the work is anything but controversial, and it is something people definitely want to know something about, and if you can dramatize it by putting the people on the air who are actually doing these things, then it will sound to the people of the province as if he were telling his own story in connection with these things.

Concerning Mr. McFarlane, for instance, his address was only descriptive of what the miners are doing. He is not connected with any government, and I have not the foggiest idea to what party he belongs, but we want these people to get before the public, so the people of the province will know of these things, and they can tell their story to the people. We have been thinking about getting time on the air ourselves, but if that time was available, why not use it in a useful way?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have no doubt that much of that material is very interesting, and I have no doubt that we could get it in a more attractive way from civil servants than from spokesmen for the Progressive-Conservative Party.

But there is a time and place for everything. The broadcasts are introduced by a standard phrase that it was part of a series in which the listeners would hear from leaders and spokesmen of the Progressive-Conservative Party. I say it is improper for you to use civil servants, and Deputy Ministers as spokesmen for the Progressive-Conservative Party. You could very properly use them on a Province of Ontario period, but it should be different from the one allotted to the expression of viewpoints by the leaders of the different political parties.

If you are going to take Deputy Ministers and other civil servants on the air in Progressive-Conservative Party time, what comes next? The next logical step would be to take them on the Progressive-Conservative platform at meetings, or to quote from them with appropriate pictures, in election literature, and inevitably the result would be to make these civil servants

part and parcel of the Party machine. I hope you are not going to do that. I do not think the people of Ontario will accept that proposition at all.

The other day the hon. Attorney-General was saying, without any foundation in fact whatsoever, that the civil servants in another province were required to identify themselves with the political party in power. That is not true. They are free to join any political party, and to be active within the law for that party, but down here now in the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Blackwell) own province, we find the government taking the civil servants on the Progressive-Conservative radio time, and it seems to me a member of that government should be the last to find fault with what is done in Saskatchewan, when they are definitely told there they can belong to any party, and they can be politically active, provided it is not done during their working hours.

Whether you agree with that policy or not, I say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) that the people of Ontario will not approve of the activities on behalf of the Progressive-Conservative Party by Deputy Ministers and civil servants. There is an important principle involved. When people listen to their radios, or go to meetings, or read literature, they should be under no misapprehension about the capacity in which these individuals are speaking. If you want to put a Deputy Minister on the air, to make an official explanation which relates exclusively to the administration of the policies decided upon by the government and this Legislature, that is one thing. But to take him on the air along with party leaders and party spokesmen of a party, on a party's time, I must say that is wrong, and I think most people will agree with me it is all wrong.

MR. FROST: It was not done on that basis.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You say it was not done on that basis, but it was Progressive-Conservative Party time, and the speakers were introduced as the leaders or spokesmen of the Progressive-Conservative Party.

MR. FROST: It was free time on the air. There was nothing political in it at all, except they were introduced as speakers who would describe some part of their important work, and it was stated at the time it was for the purpose of giving people a little more education as to what actually was going on.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What would the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) think if in one of the periods allotted to my party and myself on the air, I induced a Deputy Minister to go on and say something, entirely non-political, about the work of his department, and he was introduced, along with me, as a speaker on the time allotted to the C.C.F. Party to discuss this important question? The hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would think it was rather ridiculous, and he would have some basis for so thinking.

MR. FROST: The whole introduction was given to the people on a different basis. There was not—

MR. JOLLIFFE: My information is that the speakers on that occasion were introduced in the customary way as spokesmen for a political party who had been allotted this time in the series. I say this should not happen again, and if it does happen again, there will be a lot of trouble about it.

MR. FROST: We are having trouble now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is nothing as yet.

On vote No. 116.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I do feel that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has raised a rather important point. In fairness to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) I would like to believe that he overlooked the special character of these broadcasts, because when the speakers come on the air, the announcer says,

"This series has been established in order that a spokesman for the various political parties in the province shall have an opportunity to present their points of view."

I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that in such a series it is undesirable that civil servants should appear with the spokesmen for a political party, unless perhaps there is a disclaimer at the beginning of the broadcast, that the views of the Progressive-Conservative Party are not being put forward at that time, but the hon. Minister of such-and-such is utilizing this time in order to bring the people of the province up to date with respect to some particular department of government, and while I am in complete agreement with the suggestion that the people of Ontario should be informed fully as to their governmental functions, I do suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that it would be better if that were handled through the type of broadcast you had a year or so ago, during which the hon. Ministers themselves were denied the opportunity of speaking, and all the speaking was done by the then Premier of Ontario. I thought that was a very bad set-up, because—

MR. JOLLIFFE: We thought it was a very good setup.

MR. MACLEOD: Well, no. I must say that in my opinion the people of Ontario were the losers in not being given the opportunity to hear the Sir Laurence Olivier tones of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar)—

MR. DUNBAR: Are you getting me now? Not with a knife? With the tongue?

MR. MACLEOD: I am handing you an orchid.

MR. DUNBAR: You threatened to "get me"; not with a knife, eh?

MR. MACLEOD: I think it is too bad that the people of this province were denied for a whole year of the opportunity of listening to the delightful voice of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), to say nothing of the Gene Autrey voice of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). I do feel you have been hiding your light under a bushel, and I think you should take advantage of this time to let the people of Ontario hear just what manner of men you are.

If you want to have departmental broadcasts, I would be prepared to support any set of estimates which may come before us, containing a sum of money to be set aside to finance any such series of broadcasts by the Government of Ontario. I think if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will hearken unto the words spoken by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the point he has made, I think on further consideration he will agree that it is not a good idea to mix the two.

MR. FROST: It was purely experimental.

MR. MACLEOD: Yes, I realize that.

MR. FROST: We felt if the experiment was successful, perhaps we would engage air facilities ourselves, and have a series of broadcasts developed.

MR. MACLEOD: You were apparently satisfied that the experiment was good. Apparently there was a good response from the public. I think that should encourage you to spend some thousands of dollars to have one departmental broadcast a month, and let the people of Ontario hear both the hon. Ministers and their officials. I heard the broadcast given by the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Frost), and I thought it was excellent. I would have liked to hear more from you. I like the sound of your voice, and the words came over very well.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to a matter which I have raised for a number of years now, and that is the undertaking that was given by the Progressive Conservative Party back in 1943, that there would be a full-time Minister of Mines appointed.

MR. FROST: No, that was not it. A Mines Minister that really understood mining.

MR. MACLEOD: And the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) suggested the other day that this was the only one of the 22 points that had not been implemented, and I was rather intrigued by the fact that he was prepared to admit that it was one of the 22 points that had not been implemented. I do feel that the present Minister of Mines (Mr. Frost) has done a very good job. I have told him many times that I admire his versatility.

MR. FROST: With some mental reservations.

MR. MACLEOD: It must be said he was versatile in evil as he is versatile in good, but I have been agreeably surprised by the grasp of the work of this department, held by the present Minister, and I feel if he were occupied with that portfolio alone he would do it full justice, bue here we have a situation where the present Minister of Mines (Mr. Frost) is scheduled in a matter of 25 or 30 days, to become the Prime Minister of Ontario and—

MR. FROST: Might I say to my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) if he will look at the Estimates, he will find that the much-abused Minister gets no salary, and that is probably as much as he is worth.

MR. MACLEOD: I am not sure about that. I think if you become the Minister of Mines that you should be paid a salary, but I do feel that it is extremely difficult for any one man, even with the extraordinary abilities possessed by the present Minister (Mr. Frost) to handle three jobs—Prime Minister, Provincial Treasurer and Minister of Mines. Too much! I am sure that there are some members on the government benches—

MR. FROST: It is quite right—you people be as helpful as you can.

MR. MACLEOD: I am sure that the hon. member from Kenora (Mr. J. G. White) would be willing to leap from the back concessions on to the front benches. I am sure that Mr. Roberts would be willing to forego the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party if he could become the Minister of Mines.

AN HON. MEMBER: Another prediction.

MR. MACLEOD: And I am sure the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. W. S. Gemmell) would be glad to do a couple of hurdles in order to take over this job.

Now, I do feel that having made a solemn pledge to the people of Ontario that in the fullness of time they would have a Minister of Mines who would devote his full time to the work of this department, I think, on the 27th of April, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) should divest himself of this additional responsibility he has been carrying for the past six years.

Vote 116 agreed to.

Votes 117 and 118 agreed to.

On Vote 119.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (CCF Temiskaming): I listened with great interest to all the things the Minister (Mr. Frost) had to say about his duties, and what was going on in the north country, and I note this Estimate deals with laboratory at Cobalt. There is a little history behind this. The Minister (Mr. Frost) told you when he became Minister of Mines and made his first trip to Cobalt, we were about ready to fold up and a great salvation came along and cured us of all our ills, and now we are getting along fine.

I don't know where he got these Estimates, the money he was passing out to municipalities. It certainly is not in these Estimates and he did refer to, and I do hope in the fullness of time my good friend will get around to redeeming the grant to Cobalt.

Now, the history of this Cobalt lab. is rather unique, I believe. It is actually located in what was formerly the town hall of the Town of Cobalt. I was mayor of the town at that particular time and sold this to the Liberal Government, the late hon. Peter Heenan. We sold them

our town hall to keep them from taking away taxes of the hotel they were going to buy up there and convert it into this lab. They were going to rob us of some $1,200 taxes and we sold them our town hall for some $10,000, which cost over $50,000, and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) will say that is the best stroke of business we pulled off, to get rid of that white elephant. Now, this is where the rub comes in: We played ball with the Department of Mines and gave them a $50,000 building for $10,000. Now, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter), get in touch with the hon. Provincial Treasurer there and give it back.

Now, while on these expenditures, one thing that struck me is the permanent salaries are $7,300 and temporary $11,900. I think you have had temporary men on there a week or two at a time when loading out ore, but my suggestion is there should be more of these men on there as permanent men, reaping the benefits of pensions, all being permanent in the civil service and ready for advancement. I don't know what their salaries are, but I do suggest that they should become permanent. I do not say how many. I would think, if you check up your pay roll, you will find in the past 5 or 6 years that a lot of these men shown as temporary on here have worked permanently for the last 5 years, and I think they should be classed as permanent and given any benefits that are coming to them and receive increases when given.

Vote 119 agreed to.

On vote 120.

MR. C. C. CALDER (L London): Could the Minister (Mr. Frost) give us some reassuring word as to the adequacy of the natural gas supplies down in southwestern Ontario? Are you satisfied as to the sufficiency of supplies for next winter?

MR. FROST: Well, it is too difficult to be reassuring in connection with that problem. I would say, as is well known, supplies of natural gas are diminishing despite all of the exploration work and all of the new wells that are located and brought into production. It is still a tremendous quantity and the secret of the thing depends upon the supplement that can be added by way of artificial gas. Now, with the dominion system you have the Polymer plant at Brantford, and recently, last fall, came into production a big steel gas plant at Port Stanley and I would say with that, the dominion system should be able to carry on. This year they have really a vast surplus, actually—I mean if they were operating—and I do not think it was necessary for them to conduct their steel gas plant there, continuously. But if you go down to the Union system the Union people have been. They have by means of being able to supplement their gas from the Polymer plant, and from their own gas plant at Windsor, they have been able to completely change their set up in connection with natural gas, so instead of drawing heavily on it in the wintertime, they draw on it steadily from the various fields and then store that, and they use that evenly throughout the years. I think we are reasonably safe for 5 years, at the moment. Much is going to depend on whether gas can be imported from Texas. I would not want to venture a guess on that. I will say this; that our position down here is no doubt strengthened by the situation there is in the far western States, by the fact that Alberta has now become a province that may export gas to Seattle and some of the cities on the western coast, and some, perhaps of the midwestern cities. If that is the case, a lot of argument against importation of gas into Ontario by way of Windsor, would disappear, and that again would change the picture. It would look as if now the situation is in pretty good shape for a period of 5 years.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (L Niagara Falls): They are importing a lot of gas across the river from Fort Erie.

MR. G. S. ELLIS (CCF Essex North): The Minister (Mr. Frost) has told us that our natural supplies are diminishing. I can speak from one section of western Ontario that suffered tremendously because of that let-down on our natural gas supplies, shutting

down of our plants for some 6 months in some cases. The loss to the workers and to industry could be computed in millions. So we are much concerned about it and we are much concerned about it because, apparently, the only solution that we have today is the importation of Texas gas and butane from the United States and that, in itself, is coming over here under protest, and while it may be true that our supplies are adequate for this spring, there is very great doubt in the minds of many whether or not the supply would be adequate if this importation of Texas natural gas was stopped.

What occurs to my mind is there are two things we must safeguard ourselves against. First, that these private utilities should not be allowed to carry on a programme of expansion here.

MR. FROST: I may say to our hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) we are preventing expansion. We have, for some considerable time, prevented—

MR. ELLIS: That is still being carried out?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. ELLIS: I'm very happy to hear that. You know what happened there when a private company allowed to go out and sell heating equipment and all types of stuff and that equipment became dilapidated that it could not be used. People left "holding the bag" in equipment that could not be used.

One thing I do not think the Minister (Mr. Frost) has touched upon: what has been done by the department in respect to producing artificial gas from by-products, et cetera in the Province of Ontario. I heartily agree with what the Minister said in respect to the Province of Alberta, if it was possible.

MR. FROST: I do not think it would be brought here, but it would give us a balancing item, so that, probably, we would get gas.

MR. ELLIS: So then, the question is: what are we doing, in respect to assuring ourselves of a supply? If the United States supply is cut off tomorrow and we cannot bring Alberta gas here, what are we, in the Province of Ontario, doing about the depletion of our wells? Are we studying the possibility of obtaining artificial gas from by-products, or just what is the department doing? I think this is an extremely important question, and I am inclined to think that the amount of money set down here, $28,200, is very insignificant.

MR. FROST: Of course, you must remember this: the companies themselves are spending immense amounts of money. This amount ($28,000) here is largely in connection with our own inspection services. Now, we did enter into an arrangement between companies, universities and ourselves, to do certain surveying by way of seismograph instruments by which blasts were made at great distances underground and by way of delicate instruments to compute what would be the nature of the rock strung beneath the ground, but I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) this: that the future of the gas industry in southwestern Ontario is based on these things: first, the possibility of new discoveries in southwestern Ontario, and I may say the amount of exploration work that is going on down there is really very extensive, and there is in the hundreds of thousands of dollars being spent by the Imperial Oil Company, the Union Gas Company, the dominion and a lot of other private sources down there.

Now I think with this information that it may be that some huge body of gas will be discovered down there. It may be down a great depth, or it may be in some place, but that appears to be improbable. It would appear that the gas fields of southwestern Ontario are not too extensive. They may be numerous but very small in the amount that comes from them, and perhaps is not very great in the sum-total of our needs.

That brings us down to the second thing, and that is artificial gas. Now, artificial gas, if you can keep our

natural gas steady, if we can prevent too much duplication, to get the natural gas we have, and we supplement it sufficiently with natural gas, it would last for probably a great many years.

Now, the third thing, of course, is bringing in gas from the States. Now, I would say to the members of the House that the prospect would appear to be much brighter now than it was, perhaps, a few months ago. A year ago it looked like a "gone goose." Now, I would not say that. I would say there are very much brighter prospects in that regard than there were previously. Now, at the present time as far as artificial gas is concerned, we have the great Stanley Plant of the Dominion Company, which produces about 1,000,000 cubic feet of gas on a peak day, and we have had some quite interesting—you take, for instance, the Kimball Field has been flowing around 20,000,000 feet a day, but that, I suppose, would have a sustained yield of about 10,000,000 feet a day. I assume that. But the situation is just this, and there is not any use glancing it over, and I am not telling you anything new, that the future of our use of gas in southwestern Ontario depends on the artificial supplement mainly, plus the possibility we can get gas from the United States.

Now, we are suffering from after the war problems. My hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) knows, because, obviously, the domestic people were given the priority under the Natural Gas Conservation Act. Now, in the war days when everything was short, it was necessary for the Dominion Power Controller to just reverse that, and put great industries, like the Ford people and others, on gas, and that in the war days tremendously depleted the natural gas resources that we had, and so we have the situation as we have it at the present time, and I would say this: that very real progress has been made in the past couple of years.

Vote 120 agreed to.

On vote 121.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): Has the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) anything to tell the House with respect to the Sulphur Fumes Aribitration? We did have considerable discussion in the House in the last 4 or 5 years. I was wondering if the companies had made any progress?

HON. MR. FROST: I would say this, Mr. Chairman, a great deal of experimental work has been done by the International Nickel Company in that problem and at the present time a great deal of very expensive equipment is on order and will be installed. My officials tell me that that will alleviate the condition but it certainly will not mean there will not be any free gas go into the air because that runs into thousands of tons a day; but nevertheless there will be some alleviation and it will probably mean the heavy gas would not carry to such a radius as it previously carried and there will be perhaps less damage to crops in the locality.

I would say this, that since there have been practically no arbitrations in the area at all—I do not think there was any appeal carried to the Municipal Board at all—things appear to be going in a very reasonable sort of way.

Vote 121 agreed to.

Vote 122 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Department of Labour, page 62, vote 94.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (PC Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, before introducing my Estimates to this House, I would like to make some brief comment regarding the Department of Labour.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the sixth occasion upon which I have had the honour to present to the committee the Estimates of the Department of Labour.

I am sure you are all fully aware of the fact that the department is administrative and the cost is, to a great extent, fixed. At the outset, I should like to point out to the hon. members the costs

in the administration of the Department of Labour are expected to rise to $94,270. The major items in the increases are as follows: Cost-of-living bonus to employees, $36,000; annual increases and new staff, $32,340; and increased cost of redemption of vacation-with-pay stamps, $25,000.

In the course of his budget address, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) informed the hon. members of the House that the Province of Ontario had been favoured inasmuch as during the past year 65 per cent. of all new industry locating in Canada came to this province. In one way, we in the Department of Labour also have a guide to our industrial business expansion because it is part of the duties of the Factory Inspections Branch to check plans of all new industrial developments and improvements which are proposed to be made in this province.

Last year the value of construction represented in the plans presented to the department amounted to $59,400,000. If we were to take into account the period of the previous twenty years, over $500,000,000 worth of new factories, shops, and office buildings have been erected or altered in this period. I am sure these figures, particularly those in the year just ending, will be heartening to every hon. member of this House, because they represent the possibility of greater employment for the people of this province.

I have also noted there has been a definite trend towards the decentralization of industry and smaller communities have had the benefit of many branch plants being established in their midst which, of course, affords more employment to the people in the locality.

Last year was a very busy year both for the Ontario Labour Relations Board and the conciliation service of the Department of Labour. The Ontario Labour Relations Board held 88 sessions during the year, and 900 applications of all types were filed with the board.

The conciliation service dealt with 187 matters which were referred to me, as Minister of Labour, by the Ontario Labour Relations Board. In addition the conciliation service handled 38 applications where the parties to collective bargaining agreements made direct application to me for assistance in resolving their difficulties. I am happy to say that 36 of these cases were settled satisfactorily, and two were withdrawn by the parties.

During the past year the conciliation service dealt with 35 strike situations, and with one or two exceptions the strikes have been settled.

I am happy to refer to the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, and to point out to the members that since this Act came into force in 1944 employees in the construction industry, and, more recently, employees in industry at large who do not complete a full year of employment, have received, up until December, 1948, over $10,000,000 in vacation credits. To compare the first year of operation with the year 1949-50, you will be interested to know that as of the 31st of March, 1945, vacation credits which were cashed amounted to $377,000, and by contrast the amount of money which you will be required to vote to redeem credits for the next year is $5,500,000.

Now, this vacation system has certainly added greatly to the work of the department and the cost of the department. It is far more complicated business to administer than one would think. Stamps are purchased from the department by industry and are placed in the books; arrangements have been made that any bank in the Province of Ontario will cash these books when they become due; those books are then returned to the Department of Labour where they have to be audited and requires additional temporary staffs during the three months of the summertime of about 25 people, just to audit these books. The auditors of the government insist that each and every book be audited to make sure the man has received his proper amount and not been underpaid nor overpaid.

Then, every book has to be stamped with a press. We are running a machine shop now, stamping these books and

destroying them. This is on instructions of the auditor, but it certainly does add greatly to the work of the department.

In the Minimum Wage administration in the Minimum Wage for women; I did report to this House at an earlier date I have had great co-operation in the administration of this Act offered by the Federal Department of Labour. We have for a great many years since the inception of the Act required industry to fill out forms and state the number of female employees, rates of pay, and other information, and return them to the department. These, in turn, have to be checked and if found in violation in any case, an inspection was made and the matter corrected. But I felt that was a cumbersome thing; we could probably do a better job if we could devote more time to inspection and we devised a way of discontinuing the necessity for employers of female help to fill out these forms, and on consulting with the Department of Labour at Ottawa who have inspectors in connection with Unemployment Insurance, visiting almost every place of employment, that they would, if any case appeared to be in direct violation of the Minimum Wage, that they would report the matter to us. That is going to save us a tremendous lot of work. It is going to save business places in this province a great deal of work which they naturally object to, very much, and I think it will enable us to do a better job.

I should like to draw your attention to the work which is done in the Department of Labour in connection with the training of apprentices in the designated trades. In addition to the building and construction trades we supervise training in the motor vehicle repair trade, the barbering and hairdressing trades, and within the past year or so have added the refrigeration and air-conditioning trade to the list of designated trades.

At the present time the Department of Labour has under contract of apprenticeship 3,258 apprentices in the designated trades, and at the same time we are continuing the supervision of some 3,000 trainees who were former members of the Armed Forces. We supervise these lads in their work to see that they are being properly trained and that conditions are fair and reasonable and that they will eventually develop into good mechanics.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) where are those 3,000, the last 3,000?

HON. MR. DALEY: They are all over the place in employment, but we supervise them. We will have a man drop in where a boy is working and check to see that he is being properly treated and having an opportunity to learn something, that he is not just considered to be an apprentice, and being used at ordinary labouring work.

Recently at the convention of the Canadian Construction Association, the attention of the members of that association was directed to the limited supply of apprentices and journey-men in some of the designated trades. I should like to suggest to the hon. members that they should give some thought to bringing to the attention of their constituents and particularly to the attention of the contractors in their riding, the value of apprenticeship training and the necessity of all branches of the community co-operating to insure that a sufficient number of apprentices will enter the trade, and after the required period will become journey-men. I think that every hon. member will appreciate the importance of this type of training, and will realize that for many a young man coming along, who has a natural mechanical bent, the trades offer an honourable career and a good source of livelihood. I notice that there has been some talk of recruiting tradesmen in certain crafts outside of Canada, but it seems to me that all of us should use our best endeavours to see to it that the opportunities in these trades should go to our own boys first. I am sure that hon. members will reflect on the matter of apprenticeship training and will endeavour to assist in this most worthwhile work.

Our Boiler Inspection services have been increased, additional inspectors have been put in, and, as I men-

tioned the other night in discussing the bill re silicosis, we have foundry specialists in foundry work endeavouring, by a process of eliminating the hazards, good housekeeping in foundries and in various places where silicotic dust is prevalent, endeavouring by a spirit of education and gaining the confidence and co-operation of management, endeavouring to lessen this great hazard. I can report without fear of contradiction that the hazard, over the last few years, perhaps not because of the work of this department, but of the work of industry, realizing the difficulty and cost of this hazard and exhibiting a willingness to work in co-operation with the department and lessen the number of silicotics to a great extent. The work is going on very satisfactorily, and I would like to point out at this time, and I might perhaps be a little premature, but I have been discussing it with the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley).

As you know, I objected to making it made mandatory that every man who works where so much silicotic dust is to be found should be X-rayed. However, I would say that I would certainly endeavour to have the facilities, mobile units, available to go to each and every industry that indicated a desire to have this work done. Just recently the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) advised me that the Niagara Sanitarium had purchased a unit. That unit will be in that particular area and I see no reason why it should not be utilized throughout a reasonable area to do this work. As I said the other night, it did not meet with too much favour with some of the hon. members of the opposition, that there was a number of older men in these industries who certainly did not want to be X-rayed. However, I say now that in industry that any industry that believes that their men should be X-rayed should do it themselves, voluntarily. It does not require any legislation. I reiterate again that I am going to work on the angle that we should make available these mobile units to go into places that want it.

In regard to the grain elevators, particularly in the northern sections at the Head of the Lakes, we have done a lot of work. I would recall to the hon. members, particularly the new members, that after the great explosion that took place at the Head of the Lakes where so many men were killed and injured, the department wrote regulations controlling the operation and the work of these grain elevators.

MR. SALSBERG: Which of your branches looked after the elevators?

MR. DALEY: It comes under the Factory Inspection. We have appointed two men who are particularly skilled in the work. They worked for many years in elevators. We have endeavoured by setting up regulations in regard to the standards of housekeeping by writing regulations as to the type of the mechanical equipment that is required to be installed in the new code, in regard to electrical service. That, of course, comes under hydro. We have inspectors checking on this, and I can say this to you that this work in connection with all the grain elevators of the province is costing the operators of these elevators many millions of dollars to bring them into line and to assure the workers who are required to work in these plants that all possible hazard will be removed where it is within the ability of man to remove it. We have not been able to entirely remove the danger of silicosis, but a lot of money is being spent and a lot of effort is being put into guaranteeing workers in elevators that they will be reasonably safe and work under good conditions.

The Estimates of the Department of Labour have been increasing over the years, and this is in large measure due to the fact that our expanding industry and expanding economy in this province have required that we should extend our services. Since 1943, the number of the employees of the department has increased from 124 to 200. Of course, you appreciate that because I am, as Minister, connected with the Workmen's Compention Board there is no connection between the Department of Labour and the Workmen's Compensation Board because there are over 600 employees in

the Workmen's Compensation. In most instances the additions to the staff have been in the Inspection Service. I would like to say that the question was raised as to why we did not have a great many more inspectors or why we did not have a great many more things, we have, within the last 3 years, been working out a scheme where we were zoning the province, cutting it up into areas and levelling off the amount of work. I found some inspectors had areas where there was a tremendous concentration of industry and others had a lesser amount. We split them sideways, crossways and up and down to give them a reasonable amount of work, so as the inspectors and the industry will be well taken care of.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the Minister care to say a word at this time on the composite inspection branch? I suppose that is the branch he is speaking of?

MR. DALEY: Yes, you see, we have a boiler inspector who inspects boilers. However, a composite inspector inspects anything. When he goes into an industry he checks hours of work, minimum wages —he does everything, except the boiler. If there is a boiler in there he does not inspect that because he is not a boiler inspector.

MR. SALSBERG: What is the difference between him and the factory inspection inspector?

MR. DALEY: There is practically no difference there. You may term them all composite inspectors.

Now, I think the staff of the department are fully aware of the heavy responsibility which the department must bear in endeavouring to ensure the health and safety of the worker in industry and to promote the improvement of his working conditions. It is our feeling that the department has made a worthwhile contribution to the industrial peace and progress in this province during the past year, and I can assure the hon. members of the House that our efforts in this direction will not flag during the next year.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what I have to say regarding the Estimates of the Department of Labour. As I said before, our work is administrative, we do not build things or spend money on capital expenditure, and these Estimates were made after careful consideration. It is considered that the amounts shown on the Estimates are the required amounts of money to satisfactorily and efficiently carry on this department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (CCF Dovercourt): I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) would give me some information on Item No. 9, Vote 94. There is listed advertising, educational work, conferences, speakers, publicity, legal fees, administration of justice, witnesses and interpreters in the Department of Labour, including apprenticeship branch, boiler inspection branch, factory inspection branch, board of examiners of operating engineers, and the administration of the Private Employment Agencies Act, $11,000.00. How much of this $11,000 goes to the advertising, educational work, conferences, speakers and publicity? How much goes to legal fees? Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) explain why the two are put in under the same heading, they do not fit at all.

MR. FROST: You may understand this next item, litigation of constitutional and other questions—$5.00. It all goes to show the lawyers get very little money out of this department.

MR. SALSBERG: Visible.

MR. PARK: Is there any suggestion of how that is split up? Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) give us any indication at all?

MR. SALSBERG: While the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) thinks over these figures, I would like to make a few remarks about this item. I want to say, in my opinion, the department, the entire department is still considered by the government as a secondary one.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: Not as a major department befitting the most industrialized province of the country. I think the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), regardless of who he should be, should be seated more prominently, and I am not at all joking, I mean this seriously. I would place strong emphasis on that department if I were the government. I would take the Labour Ministry into the forefront, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) would occupy a central position and the finances of the department would be greatly enlarged.

I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park), his first speech in the House, and I told him after his speech that I listened to him and I thought I heard myself 5 years ago. I, too, appealed for more educational work, conferences and advertising to come about and nothing came. I do not know whether it is the fault of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) or the Cabinet as a whole. I am inclined to think it is the fault of the Cabinet, that they still keep this department in the background. The question that the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) raised illustrates the problem that in a province such as ours a continuously growing number of workers, our whole advertising, educational bill is $11,000 plus all the other items that the other hon. member (Mr. Park) has enumerated from the records. With that money you cannot do much. I would like to see the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) stand up and fight for more money, pressing a plan for educational work.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He has probably fought and lost.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) says: "He probably fought and lost."

MR. DALEY: That is not so.

MR. SALSBERG: I say it was true but the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) insists on assuring me that it is not true.

MR. DALEY: That is right, it is not true.

MR. SALSBERG: Therefore, the blame must fall on his shoulders.

MR. DALEY: I have no trouble getting the funds I feel I require.

MR. SALSBERG: If that is so, then it shows a lack of perspective of the department's responsibility. This Item 9 is the most glaring reflection. I do not know whether the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) can, or for that matter, whether it is important for the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to explain in detail how the $11,000 was divided up, but it is a pitiful amount—$11,000—

AN HON. MEMBER: Dear, dear.

MR. SALSBERG: —for the "advertising, educational work, conferences, speakers, publicity—"

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): And points west.

MR. DALEY: Of course, on many of those things, we do not spend any money at all.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) says he does not spend any money at all?

MR. DALEY: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: Then, what does he do with the $11,000?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DALEY: The $11,000 is spent on a few of them. We do not just go out and get into litigation and build up lawyers' fees if it is not necessary.

MR. SALSBERG: I will limit myself to these remarks on Item No. 94, and I suggest the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) last explanation that the $11,000 was not used on all the items—and there are about 57—but only on a few, even if he had used it on only one item, it would have been very inadequate.

I would like to see the Department of Labour at least imitate the Department of Agriculture.

MR. MacLEOD: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: I think the Department of Agriculture is sending out splendid publicity and a lot of it, and it is necessary. I think even the Department of Lands and Forests is doing a better job, relatively speaking. They are turning out better material, more attractive and dealing more with the problems of the industry than does the Department of Labour. It is a sad commentary on the work of the department if, after all these years, we have to take account of such a limited appropriation, which is but a reflection of a very limited horizon and conception of what the tasks of the department are.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, reference was made a few moments ago by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to an item of $5, "for litigation on constitutional and other questions." This leads me to raise a matter, which, I suggest is of some importance.

We now have in force in this province a labour code which consists of regulations adopted by order-in-council under the Labour Relations Board Act, of last year. We had, of course, in effect before the present code, the former code, which consisted of regulations in effect under the Act of 1947, if I remember correctly, or the Act of 1944, as amended in 1947.

I think the House should know that the enforcement of that Act has not been accepted by the Department of Labour, or by the Department of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell). I agree that the administration of the Act has been accepted by the Department of Labour, in the sense that members of the Labour Relations Board have been appointed and there is a staff attached to the department itself and attached to the Board which carries out the duties of administration under the Act. I think they do on the whole a very good job. But when a legal contest arises under the Act, or under the regulations, we find the department accepting almost no responsibility whatever.

We have heard during the last few days rather heated statements from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) about the necessity of making available the provincial police for the enforcement of the law during an industrial dispute. However, we get no satisfaction from the government whatever when it is a question of the enforcement of the law as against the employer under The Labour Relations Act.

MR. DALEY: We would enforce it as quickly against the employer as we would against the employee.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, it is all very well to say it would be enforced against the employers as against employees, but the fact is that it is not enforced as against the employer by the department or by any department of the government, and I will give the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) an example.

MR. DALEY: I wish you would.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will give the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) an example of what happens all the time. The procedure in the case of offences under the Labour Relations Act is a little different from the ordinary procedure, and in order to make clear what the procedure is, I am going to give an example, and perhaps the House will forgive me if the example is one from personal experience.

We have the case of an employer in the City of Kitchener. I want to make it clear that, in telling this story, I have no particular fault to find with the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley); the fault I do have to find is with the policy—and I know it is the policy—of the government and of the department not to accept the responsibility for enforcing their own labour code and their own decisions.

This is what happened: An employer in Kitchener committed what was subsequently found to be an offence under the Labour Relations Act. In order to establish the offence, it was necessary for the union, as complainant, to go to the Labour Relations Board and to ask

for leave to prosecute that employer. Now, before this had happened, the department had sent in an investigator. The department did go so far as to send in an investigator, and as a result of the investigator's report, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) did appoint a commission. He appointed Judge Cross, the County Court Judge in Oxford, to investigate the alleged offence.

Judge Cross held a hearing in the City of Kitchener, and he found the evidence established that the offence had been committed and that at least seven men had been discharged for union activities, and he made a report as commissioner. On the basis of Judge Cross's report, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) issued an order under the Act that the employer should reinstate these men in their jobs, and that order was duly sent to the employer. However, the company ignored the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) order, and that is where the offence arose, the offence in respect of which a prosecution was required. The company defied the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) order, and here we have, Mr. Chairman, a certain company—I do not think it is necessary that I should name the company for purposes of illustration—here we have an Ontario company, deliberately, openly defying an order issued by the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) by virtue of the authority vested in him by the Labour Relations Act.

When this was brought to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) what are we told? We are told it is up to us to prosecute, that there is no department of government that accepts the responsibility of enforcing the law when an offence of this kind takes place.

You see, that just does not "square" with the fine words of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) about the importance of enforcing the law. In a strike situation, there is no hesitation about sending the provincial police at the expense of the taxpayer, sometimes at great expense, to enforce the laws against the employees, but when an employer in the City of Kitchener, openly, brazenly defies the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) order under the law, nothing is done about it and nothing would ever have been done about it had not the union engaged counsel to go to Kitchener and take the prosecution.

Therefore, we have an anomalous situation—I say it is an anomalous situation—where the union counsel must go to the City of Kitchener and must arrange with the Crown Attorney to conduct the prosecution against this company The Department of Labour is not interested, the Attorney-General's department is not interested, the Crown Attorney is not in a position to take the case, for reasons I will not mention.

MR. DALEY: Have not the unions some responsibility?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I beg your pardon?

MR. DALEY: Have not the unions some responsibility for their men?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Of course, Mr. Chairman, that is just the point.

MR. DALEY: Sure it is the point.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Of course the union has a responsibility, but when an offence is charged against the employees, who accepts the responsibility for prosecution? Your government and Crown Attorneys accept the responsibility. It is only where there is an offence charged against an employer that you talk differently and will not do anything about it.

In this particular case the union counsel conducted the prosecution on behalf of the Crown, the Crown was getting a little free service, and the company was convicted and fined $3,120.

Now, why should a union have to bear the expense of that prosecution? That is the question I would like the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) to answer: why should that union in that case have to bear the expense of that prosecution?

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): They have only $5.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why is it in a case of this kind your department and

the department of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) does not accept responsibility? Let us have an answer to that question.

MR. DALEY: The thing is, we process the whole business up to a point of establishing the fact on the commissioner's report that these men had been wrongly dismissed. Now, you represent those men, it seems to me that is where you should step in and—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do you say that to employers?

MR. DALEY: If we did everything that you could suggest we should do—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, no.

MR. DALEY: —there would not be any reason for bargaining groups or solicitors for unions. I mean—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now, now.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): We are not concerned about the solicitors.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Perhaps I can explain the matter a little more clearly for the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). In the final event, what this company was actually charged with was, not with the offence of discharging the men for union activity, that issue had already been tried and disposed of by Judge Cross; what the company was charged with was the offence of refusing, or neglecting to comply with an order of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). That is what they were charged with. The ground on which they refused to comply with the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) order was this, they said: "We do not think your Act is any good, we think it is constitutionally questionable, and upon that ground we are going to defy the Minister's order."

Now, if ever there was a case in which the government is interested, if there was ever a case in which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) should be interested, that is it. Certainly the hon Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) should be interested. Instead, what happens? Instead, the prosecution has to be conducted the whole matter has to be fought out by counsel for the union, and not by counsel for the Crown or for the government. So you have a prosecution, you have a conviction, in which the right of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to make this order is upheld, and it is all done "for free" for your government by the union.

Now, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has not answered my question as to why his constitutional power to issue that order should be upheld at somebody else's expense, nor has he explained why the difference between this case and other cases where the power of ministers of the Crown is in question, or where there appears to have been an offence committed.

The matter is particularly well grounded, because in this case you had a preliminary investigation by an officer of your own department. In addition you had a report from a County Court Judge showing in effect that the original offence had been committed. Now, what more could you want by way of evidence that there ought to be a prosecution for defiance of your order? As I say, there was a prosecution, the company was heavily fined, and there is an appeal under way at the present time, and we find neither the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) nor the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) have any part in the appeal. If there is a valid reason, I would be interested to hear it, but I do not know why it should be that in a case of this kind, unlike so many others, in a case involving, as a matter of fact, a matter of constitutional law, you have the union in this case as private prosecutor having to carry the burden, carry the fight on a fairly important issue.

MR. DALEY: It is definitely a matter of policy. We have processed the case up to a certain point—

MR. JOLLIFFE: But you did not prosecute.

MR. DALEY: —and establish things—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why not prosecute?

MR. DALEY: I am not saying we should not, it just has not been done. In a great many of these cases I appoint a commissioner and he finds one way or the other, we issue an order—

MR. JOLLIFFE: And that is the end of it?

MR. DALEY: And by the time you get around to it, the very man you go to this expense and trouble for is gone, he would not return to that plant anyway. In a great many cases we find they leave and have better jobs maybe and will not go back.

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (CCF Woodbine): You have not run out of excuses.

MR. DALEY: Are you going to continue on in a case like that? No. I would say, unless the policy of the government were to be changed—I will admit I should probably give this very thing some more consideration, but I would say this has worked very well. You cite one case, and I imagine probably that is the only case you can cite—

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, now. Let me ask you another question.

MR. DALEY: —in five years.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Can the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) or the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) cite to me one single case in which an employer has ever been prosecuted on behalf of the Department of Labour or on behalf of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), by their departments or by Crown Attorneys, anywhere in Ontario? Can they mention a single case in which an employer has been prosecuted under The Labour Relations Act?

MR. DALEY: No, I do not think I can.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I did not think you could.

MR. DALEY: I can say that we have not prosecuted any, but I believe that is marks for us; we settle most of these things without necessity of prosecution. We do not try to prosecute, we try to get people to use reason and settle these things in the proper manner. We are not trying to get people into court, we are trying to keep them out of court and get industry rolling, and we have been pretty successful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, in theory that is very sound. The hon. Minister has just told us there have never been any prosecutions as against employers or anyone else as far as he knows on behalf of his department; but what my hon. friends over there who were applauding so thoughtlessly a moment ago did not realize is that hundreds of employees have been prosecuted for one offence and another by the servants of this province at the taxpayers' expense.

MR. DALEY: Under the Labour Relations Act?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, in connection with matters very closely related to the Labour Relations Act, yes.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (PC Attorney-General): Oh, no. Oh, no.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Have you not prosecuted some under the Labour Relations Act?

MR. BLACKWELL: No, it is not related to the Labour Relations Act, what you are talking about now, and you know it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has not answered my question. Is it not a fact there have been people prosecuted under the Labour Relations Act?

MR. BLACKWELL: I will answer that in a minute.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All right.

MR. BLACKWELL: You brought me into it, and I will answer it in a minute.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All right. The fact is, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) knows that many hundreds of workers throughout this province have been prosecuted at this province's expense for offences against the law, and if he can mention in this House tonight any employer who has been prosecuted for any offence under the law with relation to collective bargaining or labour relations or strikes or anything of the kind, I will be very interested to hear it. I think we should have a clear understanding how far this alleged "impartiality" actually extends.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): Hear, hear.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, in reply to that, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) knows perfectly well that the prosecutions he is referring to are for breaches of the Criminal Code which is a responsibility of the Attorney-General's department. It has nothing to do with the collective bargaining legislation of the province.

Now, on the other hand, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) acting in his capacity as a solicitor for a party, had some feeling there should be a question of intervention by the Attorney-General's department by way of advice to the department of government that handles those prosecutions, he knows perfectly well it would receive attention if he came here, instead of saving it up to "yowl" about in the Legislature.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I know the kind of attention it would receive. I know the kind of attention it would receive very well, and the House—

MR. BLACKWELL: You have no right to say these things.

MR. JOLLIFFE: —and the House will notice the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has not answered my question. He has not given any explanation why it is that hundreds of workers have been prosecuted for offences, as he says, alleged offences under the Criminal Code for the enforcement of which the province is responsible.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now, why is the province not responsible for the enforcement of its own law represented by the Labour Relations Act, 1944, amended in 1947, and again in 1948?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has made that point abundantly clear: Between the two things there is a vast difference—

MR. MILLARD: Not clear.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is a matter of opinion. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) are quite entitled to express their opinions. At the moment, I am expressing mine. I say there is a vast difference in the bargaining legislation, where the offence has to do with what happened under the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Act. Here he says what he attempts to do is to conciliate the parties, instead of prosecuting. The other is a question of conduct under the Criminal Code of a violent type—and make no mistake, it is violent, and requires the immediate intervention of the police to stop it, and when that intervention is not adequate without having to arrest people, it follows they have to be arrested. That is a distinction, and that is the answer.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let me make this distinction clear. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) receives a report from a county court judge, after he has held an investigation under the Labour Relations Act. The judge makes a very definite finding. On the basis of that finding, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) issues an order. The company defies that order for six months. Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) still say the Government of Ontario has no responsibility for the enforcement of the law after a defiance for six months of an order issued under one of your own Acts?

MR. BLACKWELL: I still say, Mr. Chairman, very definitely, that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has in the past, and should in the future,

exercise some good discretion about that sort of thing. I want to add to that, that in the field of other types of offences, there have been numerous cases where prosecutions have not been proceeded with, provided they were the type of prosecutions desired by a private individual, as contrasted with the type of prosecutions instituted by the Crown officers themselves. I will give the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) a specific example of that.

During the Ford strike in Windsor a number of charges were laid by the Ford Motor Car Company, and I remember being in Ottawa at the time the strike was settled, and meeting there the officials of the Ford Motor Car Company, the strike having just been settled, and I reminded them then that these were not Crown prosecutions at Windsor, and if it was agreeable to the Ford Motor Car Company, and if they wished not to proceed, that the Crown would not proceed. All these charges were not proceeded with by that company on my personal suggestion, so there in a private case I was exercising a proper discretion, as has been exercised by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) under the Labour Relations Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Perhaps I have not made my point clear. After a county court judge has made a very definite finding, after hearing evidence under oath, and he makes a report to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), and the hon. Minister accepts his report, and recommendation, and issues an order to comply, and the company for month after month deliberately defies the hon. Minister's order, where is there any place for conciliation or for the exercise of discretion in the interests of harmony, when you have a company deliberately and openly defying the hon. Minister's order? Obviously, you have a situation where there is no place for conciliation, and in which it is perfectly apparent that the company is inviting a test of the hon. Minister's power to make an order and enforce the order. Under those circumstances, I suggest it is just nonsense to talk about conciliation or the use of discretion. The company has defied the law, and I suggest that the hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) should accept the responsibility for taking up that challenge and enforcing the law, if it can be made to stick, and I think it can, notwithstanding the opinion of some other lawyers, and I suggest—and I am quite certain about this, and not too hostile, I assure the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell, that he and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) should get together and consider the kind of cases in which it would be appropriate for the Crown to accept the responsibility for enforcing the law. Let us not be confused between that kind of case, and a case where conciliation is appropriate, and I do suggest to you that where there is a deliberate defiance of the law, and of the hon. Minister's powers under that law, where it is apparent that is the issue, the Department of Labour and the Department of the Attorney-General ought to join forces and consider whether or not their responsibility is to see the thing is tested in the courts. I think that should be done at the taxpayers' expense, and not at the whim of a private informer, and should not be dependent upon the financial resources of a private prosecutor. In the case I cited, there was an order issued by the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) which was not accepted, and which has been consistently defied by the company in question. That goes far beyond anything the hon. Minister (Mr. Blackwell) was talking about, and it goes far beyond any information under a provincial Act. It involves the authority of this government and the validity of its own legislation.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, on that point, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) of course, did cover considerably more territory than the one order in question. He linked that up with criminal law enforcement, to try and get on the record about the partiality of law enforcement—

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have asked you if you had ever prosecuted an employer, and you cannot tell me of any case.

MR. BLACKWELL: In this particular case I will not express an opinion, because of an order I have not seen, and under circumstances I have not examined, because it was never submitted to me. I want to reiterate what I said before, that if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) had been interested in having that matter pressed by arguing there was a duty on the government and that the Attorney-General had a function, and he should have seen the Attorney-General and suggested he had that function, and got that sort of an examination in a timely way, and not hoarded it up for the Legislature. It might have been much more beneficial to his own clients if he had handled it in that way.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I had no thought that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) would be interested, and everything he has said tonight shows that he is not interested in it.

MR. BLACKWELL: That statement is completely uncalled for, and shows entirely the biased and prejudiced attitude of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) on this question.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You still cannot tell me about the prosecution of a single employer.

MR. BLACKWELL: That is handled by the Department of Labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: If the prosecution was handled by the Department of Labour, I want to ask a question, which is not hoarded up, but which became known this evening. I have here the night edition of the *Toronto Telegram,* in which we are informed that Chief Justice Robertson, in a written judgment handed down at Osgoode Hall today, ruled that there is no provision in the Criminal Code for a private prosecutor to be heard on an appeal from a summary conviction in a labour case. Where was the Attorney-General's Department when a case of this sort was permitted to proceed, and a private prosecutor to go after the workers, when it is obviously a case without precedent, and the Chief Justice found it irregular, and threw it out on that basis? If you talk about "impartiality"; if you talk about "accepting your responsibility for the enforcement of the law," and say that you can enforce it with equal impartiality on both groups, where were you, and the Department of the Attorney-General, and the Department of Labour, when you permitted a private prosecutor, to come into court and prosecute the workers, when there is no precedent in the criminal law for such action?

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) knows perfectly well that neither the Department of Labour nor the Department of the Attorney-General conduct any case that comes before the criminal courts of the province. There are many of them throughout the province, and it is a question of whether or not the local justice of the peace accepts the information.

MR. SALSBERG: But the Attorney-General finds the case where in his opinion a striker has not received sufficient punishment, and he appeals the case. In such a case the Attorney-General is very alert, and very well informed, but not in a case of this sort.

MR. BLACKWELL: He is informed, if it is brought to his attention.

MR. PARK: On this question of the advertising item, on vote 94; I want to ask the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) what the practise of his Department is in placing advertisements in publications? I will bring a couple of examples to his attention.

In my hand I have two publications, one called *The Canadian Unioner,* and the other *Canadian Labour Management,* both of them with large advertisements from the Department of Labour, with the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) name and the name of the Deputy Minister, the crest of the Province of Ontario, and all the rest of it. The Better Business Bureau of the City of Toronto says

these publications are "rackets," and yet the Department of Labour of the Province of Ontario is advertising in them. I wonder if there is any significance in the fact that this same publication runs the picture of the national leader of the Progressive-Conservative Party on the front page, and the publication contains attacks on all legitimate trade unions within its pages, and attacks on the C.C.F., go along with them, and yet the Department of Labour is advertising in a publication described by the Better Business Bureau as a "racket"—is this a place to spend the taxpayers' money?

MR. SALSBERG: Is that out of the $11,000?

MR. PARK: I presume so. It is very significant that this advertisement was placed in the June, 1948, issue of the publication. I do not suppose that would have any significance at all, either. I want to ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) how could the Department of Labour be spending the public's money in advertising in publications which if checked with the Better Business Bureau, would be told were nothing but "rackets"?

MR. DALEY: Perhaps I should consult you every time I decided to put an advertisement in a publication.

MR. MACLEOD: That is not an answer.

MR. DALEY: You are only speaking your opinion. The way these advertisements take place is this; many of these publications have received an annual advertisement to assist them, from the department. These were not started by myself, but were started long before I ever took office, and those publications which are still in existence, makes it a matter of routine. The one you mentioned there is changed from—I forget what is used to be—to the *Canadian Unioner,* but do not forget that we spend a goodly part of the $11,000 in that sort of thing.

MR. SALSBERG: That is just too bad.

MR. DALEY: And the Congress gets a big share of it. Do not forget that, when you are holding your Convention. If you are going to kick about a little $25 ad., we will have to give some consideration of the whole scheme, and cut them all out, and not do any of it. I am not so sure but what it would not be a good idea.

MR. FROST: May I just say to my hon. friend (Mr. Park) about this advertising business; through the Provincial Savings Offices I suppose I get a request every week from some labour organization. I do not know whether they are C.C.F. affiliates or what they are, but in many instances I have been giving them advertisements for years back, perhaps $30 or $35, and sometimes even $50. The truth of the matter is that it may be that in some cases I have given it to some organization who should not get it, but I have erred on the side of being generous with these people, because, in the main, their aim is good, they are trying to get along, and if we can help them, all right.

If my friend (Mr. Park) wants to be critical about one or two, if he wants us to, we will cut out the whole works. If you want them all cut out, all right. Personally, I think it is bad business to cut it out, but try and be a little reasonable about these things. After all, we are bound to make the occasional mistake. If I gave to my friend (Mr. Park) the list of advertisements that we have inserted in one branch or another to help these good people, he would be surprised. Many times I have submitted the names to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), but some of them I knew had been receiving advertisements before, and I gave them to them again. What do you want? After all, be a little reasonable.

MR. PARK: All I ask of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is this; he should do two things; first of all, do what any ordinary business man would do when approached for advertising, and find out whether the agency is a legitimate agency, or whether it is a "racket"—

MR. DALEY: If you think I am

going to run all over the place trying to find that out, you are badly mistaken.

MR. FROST: I will cut the "whole works" out, and tell them it was on account of a complaint from the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park).

MR. MILLARD: Do not get so worried.

MR. FROST: I will tell them the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) is kicking about this, and we will cut them all out.

MR. PARK: If the hon. Minister would be quiet—

MR. FROST: If you could keep quiet we would get along better. You are complaining about every little thing.

MR. PARK: All I ask is the Department of Labour, or any other department of government, which may be giving advertisements to so-called labour sources, that they check the source—

MR. FROST: We will send them all over to you.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is wrong with that?

MR. PARK: Send them to the Better Business Bureau, so they can check them.

MR. FROST: We will cut them all out.

MR. PARK: If they come near the Labour Relations Board they will be thrown out of the window.

MR. BLACKWELL: What annoys you is the picture of George Drew on it.

MR. PARK: What worries me is that the money of the taxpayers of the Province of Ontario is being spent—

MR. DALEY: And you do not want it spent that way?

MR. FROST: We will cut it all out.

MR. PARK: Give your advertisements to perfectly legitimate trade union publications.

MR. DALEY: If you think we can investigate every little $25 ad., you are mistaken.

MR. PARK: That is just criticism. The answer that you will "cut it all out" is not an answer to the question. Let the department take the responsibility of doing what any ordinary, good, sane businessman would do when he is solicited for an advertisement; let him check the matter with the Better Business Bureau and that is all I ask them to do. If the Better Business Bureau will approve it, they will not get any criticism from me.

MR. DALEY: Well, the Better Business Bureau is not running the Department of Labour.

MR. MILLARD: That is for sure.

MR. DENNISON: Here is the point; if the government wants to get value for the money they spend in this advertising you should, first of all, find out what circulation these papers have. I have had these people asking me for ads for my own business, and when I checked the circulation in some instances I found the circulation just goes to the people who buy the ads.

MR. SALSBERG: They still carry news about the Japanese war, on the front page.

MR. DENNISON: It is just like some of the softball ads; the only people who get the programmes are those who put the advertising in—the suckers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: Surely we must not be put in the same position as are naïve businessmen who are "taken in" by such publications.

MR. FROST: At your request we will cut them all out.

MR. PARK: I am making no such request.

MR. FROST: Certainly you are; you are raising the question—

MR. DALEY: We will get requests

for a large amount of advertising from organized labour in the very near future.

MR. LEAVENS: This will not help the Department of Labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Quack, quack.

MR. MACLEOD: I presume we are still on Item No. 94.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. MACLEOD: I assure you, Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to pursue the matter that has been under discussion for the last few moments. I think that this is, perhaps, the most appropriate moment to request the Minister (Mr. Daley) to tell the House why it is that he is so reluctant and has been so reluctant for the past 5 or 6 years, to convene the Labour Committee. Now, will those characters in the back row stop aping my gestures? If you don't like them, go out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aping?

MR. MACLEOD: Yes, and they are very poor apes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) that he stick to his subject and there is nothing in here about Labour Committee.

MR. MACLEOD: We are discussing the Estimates of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and this Legislature has a Standing Committee on Labour, and there is no other more appropriate opportunity to raise the question of regular meetings of this committee than now. I know you want to be fair, and I am sure you are going to give me an opportunity of making my point.

Now, this question has been raised quite a number of times in the last number of years, and I assure the Minister (Mr. Daley) I am not raising it in order to pick on him, at all. I think that the hon. members of the House are struck by the fact that the Standing Committee on Agriculture set up at the opening of each session, meets with regularity and the chairman of that committee, the hon. member who sits opposite me takes his chairmanship of that committee very seriously and plans the work of that committee so that the important agricultural organizations in the Province of Ontario have the opportunity of appearing before the committee and the hon. members of the Legislature given the opportunity to consult and confer with the officials of the Department of Agriculture, and, very often, bills which have to do with the Department of Agriculture are referred to that committee.

Now, some of us for a period of years have been suggesting that the Labour Committee of this Legislature should be treated in the same fashion and that labour legislation, bills having to do with labour legislation, should be referred to that committee and discussed. There we would have the benefit of expert advice from the officials of the department, and I have felt for a long time that this would be a splendid education for hon. members of the Legislature who might be on that committee, who did not live in urban ridings, and it would certainly give the Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) himself, an opportunity to explain more fully points which perhaps he is unable to cover in the regular formal debates that take place on second reading in the House. Now, I do suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that if the Standing Committee on Agriculture can be the active body that it is, there is no reason in the world why a committee which affects the daily lives of hundreds and thousands of workers in this province should not function in the same serious fashion, and I find it very difficult to understand the studied reluctance on the part of the Minister of Labour to convene that committee at the beginning of every session and give it an opportunity to hold regular meetings throughout the session.

If he once started this procedure, he, himself would feel very gratified by the satisfactory results that would follow. Now, as I say, I am not raising it to needle or to pick fault. I am raising it

as a serious proposal, and I would feel very glad if the Minister (Mr. Daley) would tell us that he will follow this procedure when the Legislature meets next year.

MR. DALEY: I can only say in reply to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) the government accepts its responsibilities in regard to these Labour problems. They are all contentious and there certainly is a great variety of views of what should and what should not be done and the convening of the Labour Committee in my opinion, would be nothing more or less of a sounding board to publicity—

MR. MACLEOD: Is that true of the Agricultural Committee?

MR. DALEY: It is an entirely different proposition.

MR. SALSBERG: Why don't you set up a standing committee?

MR. DALEY: What committee?

MR. SALSBERG: A standing committee on labour.

MR. DALEY: If there was something that developed that would be the reason for calling it, but at the moment I cannot think of one.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): There are two or three items under Vote 94 which I would like to ask the Minister (Mr. Daley) about. The first one I would like to draw to your attention is the question of cost of living bonus for the entire department under Item 12, of $36,000. Now, it seems to me that is a wrong salary policy for the department to be following. You are definitely identifying that labour—you know the situation, and I say that this whole principle of cost of living bonus is wrong, and certainly the government should set an example and not force an injustice of this kind. Because the cost of living bonus is something that is not to be depended upon. It can be taken away by a sliding scale proposition, and cost of living bonus is based on the fact that salaries are adequate and all you have to do is add or subtract the cost of living bonus to keep them in line.

MR. DALEY: May I interject a word? It says here: "Cost of Living Bonus," but actually it is not a cost of living bonus. It was simply a bonus in view of the increasing cost of living that was taking place that the government then decided, and it was not a policy of the Department of Labour—it was a policy of the Provincial Government, to pay all the employees that sum of money. It is a bonus.

MR. MILLARD: You say it is a bonus based on the increased cost of living—let us put it that way.

MR. DALEY: You have to have some reason to do a thing.

MR. MILLARD: What I am asking the government to give, is some reason for incorporating the so-called cost. It is good that civil servants should know that.

MR. FROST: We have already told them. They were very glad and very satisfied to get it.

MR. MILLARD: I imagine they were so poor, financially, they were tickled to get it.

MR. FROST: We have the best salaries and we have the highest salaries for civil servants in Canada now.

MR. MILLARD: It may be the highest in Canada, but we do not think they are overpaid, and we do not think they are paid in comparison to workers engaged in other industries.

MR. FROST: Well, they are.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to ask under Item 7 you have here "Insurance premium of Caisson Inspector against injury, death or permanent disability," and then a little further down, in Item No. 11, you have "Compensation, medical, hospital and other accounts, for workmen injured in government work as awarded by the Workmen's Compensation Board, including proportion of administration expenses."

Now, I would like the Minister (Mr. Frost) to explain that particular item of $500 and the $232 as a special insurance premium for one inspector. Now, before the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) rises to explain about this let me make my point. I want to ask—are not the members on your staff in your department covered by Workmen's Compensation ,and, if they are not, why are they not? Secondly, why is one particular inspector, because of the hazardous nature of his job, covered by a special premium and why are not all members of your staff—inspectors and otherwise —covered by some kind of insurance plan? That is what I want to know, regarding those items.

HON. MR. DALEY: Of course, you ask a question on No. 7 and then you answer it because it is considered to be a hazardous occupation, the examination of Caissons and other department fields.

MR. MILLARD: Other inspectors may be injured, too. What about them?

HON. MR. DALEY: They would be covered by the Workmen's Compensation.

MR. MILLARD: Are they all under Workmen's Compensation?

HON MR. DALEY: Sure.

MR. MILLARD: Do you not pay the same as in the other amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Board?

HON. MR. DALEY: No. That is just an estimate.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): I have a Workman's Compensation case I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), and I was wondering if it would be suitable to discuss it under Item 11, Page 94?

HON. MR. DALEY: No.

MR. TEMPLE: Under what item may I discuss this Workmen's Compensation case that I wish to draw to the attention of the members of this House?

HON. MR. DALEY: You can discuss it when you can find the place for it, but not in my Estimates. I am not going into all the compensation cases.

MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss this case.

HON. MR. DALEY: I submit this is not the time nor the place to discuss a compensation case. If the hon. member wants to discuss a compensation case, I am willing at any time, if it is the same one he came to my office about, which I presume it is.

MR. TEMPLE: That is right.

HON. MR. DALEY: That is the only one you have.

MR. TEMPLE: This is one I am dissatisfied with and would like to draw to the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) attention again. I might explain to the House, Mr. Chairman, last fall a woman in my riding—

HON. MR. DALEY: I object.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): After all, we have a lot of work to do.

MR. TEMPLE: I wish to announce I wrote him a very nice letter on January 7th and explained the case and have not received a reply to the letter.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (LP St. Andrew): That is okay, I had the same trouble. Just send a registered letter.

MR. TEMPLE: Can I be given some assurance when I can bring the matter to the attention of the Legislature? It is a matter of great injustice, and I believe this is the place in which we should discuss it.

HON. MR. DALEY: It is the place but not the time.

MR. TEMPLE: You just tell me the time. I appreciate all the problems you have and I want to co-operate with you and help you. I have not been obstreperous or cantankerous.

HON. MR. DALEY: As soon as I get through the Estimates I will discuss it if you can get it in.

MR. TEMPLE: Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) assure me he will look at my letter of January 7th again and do something about it?

HON. MR. DALEY: I have the answer. I am not going to discuss it. I have the answer.

HON. MR. FROST: Drop around and see him (Mr. Daley).

MR. TEMPLE: I have been around to see him and written letters and I have not received any satisfaction.

HON. MR. DALEY: You wrote me one letter.

MR. TEMPLE: Two letters.

HON. MR. DALEY: One letter, and you came once and I gave you a good hearing.

MR. TEMPLE: Before I vote for the hon. Minister's salary in the main item, I would like to have his assurance that he will consider the letter of January 7th when I brought to his attention a glaring case of injustice to a good Canadian citizen in High Park riding, a woman who had three fingers taken off her right hand and awarded a pension of $7.75 a month. That is a case of injustice that I think the hon. members here want to hear about. Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) promise to do something about it?

HON. MR. DALEY: You come over to my office tomorrow morning and I will show you the report of the Board.

MR. TEMPLE: I am asking if you would check this personally yourself and take a look at the woman without those fingers.

HON. MR. DALEY: What is the good of that? I could check every injured person in the province.

MR. TEMPLE: Do I understand if I go to his office he is going to make arrangements to interview this woman who has undoubtedly suffered a great injustice, and will do something about it?

HON. MR. DALEY: No, no, I am not promising any such thing. You come to my office and I will show you the report I received from the Workmen's Compensation Board in that particular case.

MR. TEMPLE: If the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) would read that letter I wrote on January 7th, I pointed out several inaccuracies and several instances in which the report of the Compensation Board was not fair.

HON. MR. DALEY: In your opinion.

MR. TEMPLE: I want the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to answer that letter and tell me where my opinion is wrong. He has not done so. I want to bring it to the attention of the House. I want you to tell me when I can lay these facts in front of the Legislature. Certainly it is a case—

THE CHAIRMAN: This matter has already been discussed.

MR. TEMPLE: It has been discussed where?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) discussed it.

MR. TEMPLE: This is not Mr. Salsberg's case. This is a case in High Park where I do not think Mr. Salsberg has been heard of.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I object. I heard from a Conservative supporter after she heard my speech on the radio and told me if she lived in St. Andrew she would vote for me, but she lived in High Park.

MR. TEMPLE: The Workmen's Compensation Board is a department of this government. Do I understand we have no opportunity to discuss the operations of that Board at any time during the session of this Legislature?

THE CHAIRMAN: It could have beeen discussed in debate.

MR. TEMPLE: That is an amazing situation.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member has all sorts of opportunity. We have had the debate. I suggest you go over and see my hon. friend tomorrow; he is a most reasonable individual.

MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Chairman, I am going to take the advice of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). I hope I can count on his support in having the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) give this matter more consideration. After all, it is a tragic case. I will be over in your office in the morning.

HON. MR. DALEY: You were there before and I treated you nicely and welcomed you in, pleased to see you.

MR. G. E. PARK (CCF Dovercourt): On the question of letters being written to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and not receiving replies, I have had occasion, and I want to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) if in future when an hon. member of the Legislature writes to him he could give it his attention? I have written on two occasions that come to mind immediately; one involving the interpretation of the Industry and Labour Board under the two weeks' vacation with pay Act, and the other involving employment practices by the Workmen's Compensation Board which I had hoped we could discuss under this item, but which it seems we cannot. I think that when an hon. member of this Legislature writes to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) it would be common courtesy for him to reply.

HON. MR. FROST: My friend always has a grouch against somebody.

HON. MR. DALEY: You can ask more questions of the Minister of Labour than a Philadelphia lawyer would be able to answer.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): On Vote 94, Item 14, I am just wondering why this appropriation for Warrior's Day Council is in the Department of Labour? What is Warrior's Day?

HON. MR. DALEY: That is the big Labour party and Warrior's Day down at the exhibition. Don't you want us to put that in?

MR. MacLEOD: I did not know it was called Warrior's Day, I thought it was called Labour Day.

HON. MR. DALEY: We do lots of good things and then get pulled over the coals for $15 item.

MR. MacLEOD: That is what you call Labour Day, "Warrior's Day." We will have to come out in full battle dress next year.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (CCF Bracondale): On Items 15 and 16, I do not want the government to turn around and say they are cutting the grants off. I have no objection to the grants. I think there may be some reason for debate on the grant that is here. You have a grant here for the National Labour Day Committee of $100 and for the International Labour Day Celebration Committee, $300. That was probably the right ratio about five years ago, but it is not the right ratio now. I would ask the grant be raised a little, not lowered or cut out, but raised.

HON. MR. DALEY: You want to get some better salesmen.

MR. MacLEOD: On that point, would it not be a good idea to move that miscellaneous item up to the item of $1,000 and settle that between the Labour Day Committee and the International Labour Day Committee, and then give $400 to the miscellaneous? What about that?

HON. MR. DALEY: After what has gone on here tonight, I am very seriously considering cutting it all out.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (CCF York West): Try it.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, before we pass Vote No. 95, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) who devised the formula for payment

of workmen's compensation where a workman of either sex is injured and loses fingers, hands or legs? I did mention a case last Thursday night or Friday morning, of an individual injured and making enquiries, Mr. Morrison, at that time Chairman of the Board, said that is the formula for the loss of a foot. He said that this man was lucky, if they had taken off his foot he would still get $29.75 a month. I think these rates should be based on the amount that the individual has lost as earning power and if an individual is capable of earning $150, $250 a month and if his ability to earn that amount is taken away by half, the balance should be made up by compensation. On this particular case I mentioned last Friday morning, that individual's capacity to earn anything is taken away from him but all he has to compensate him is $29.75 a month. Who makes up the formulas?

MR. DALEY: He is a total disability?

MR. THORNBERRY: With that foot he cannot engage in the only work he is able to do, pick and shovel work. He is not able to speak the language properly, he probably could do a job as operator if he was trained for it but he cannot speak the language. He is handicapped there.

MR. DALEY: Of course, there is a formula established.

MR. THORNBERRY: If he were a draughtsman his capacity to earn money would not be too badly off and he would still get the $29.75 but he cannot work and he still gets $29.75. I do not think that is fair.

MR. PARK: This is a very important administrative branch of the Department of Labour, and it has one that has come in for a lot of criticism and one about which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) ought to be prepared to say something.

MR. DALEY: Which one?

MR. PARK: Vote 95, Industry and Labour Board. The other night I indicated to him some of the grievances that labour feels with regard to regulations and rulings which were not, in fact, in line with the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, as amended. I might mention the question of the ruling that had been made by the board with respect to payment for vacations where they had ruled that an employer could cut out the pay he gave to a worker for statutory holidays, the pay he gave for the previous year's holidays in computing the amount of the worker's earnings, upon which he gave that vacation with pay. That ruling was given on August 5, 1948, to my knowledge in the case of the National Steel Car Corporation in Hamilton, and the letter on the matter is signed by Mr. Billington, the chairman of the board. I can see no reason whatever for that. There is certainly nothing in the Act or in the amendment for the board to issue a ruling like that. The only effect is that a corporation like NASCO is able to take two or three "bucks" off the vacations of their employees, an average of $2.00 or $3.00 off their vacation. That was not the impression the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) gave this House when he spoke on his amendments in 1947. He gave the impression that the 2 per cent. was to apply to the total earnings.

MR. DALEY: It is debatable whether a statutory holiday is earnings.

MR. PARK: You had better not tell that to your conciliation service, because if you made a request for a wage increase they will tell you it is worth half a cent. an hour they will tell you it is earnings.

MR. DALEY: It is still debatable. There are a lot of people who give holidays of their own accord that have not been negotiated for by organized labour or anything else. Just because someone may give their employees statutory holidays and pay them you are going to say, in relation to that, you have to pay them more for that. If you do not use a measure of common sense in administering this thing you can reach a point they would not do anything.

MR. MILLARD: They pay office workers salaries, but they do not take from their vacations.

MR. PARK: They always seem to hit the worker and not the bosses when these common sense rulings are made. The fact remains that the effect of this order by the Ministry of Labour—

MR. DUNBAR: I never heard the like in my life.

AN HON. MEMBER: Listen to yourself some time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to try to get along. We have given plenty of latitude, we have been asked a lot of irrelevant questions. Let us get these Estimates done. The hon. members have had plenty of latitude. Latitude should not become licenced in this.

MR. PARK: I appreciate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) wanting to get through as soon as possible, but certainly an administration decision of the Industry and Labour Board is proper matter for discussion, but a vote item, for the Industry and Labour Board. All I want to say in reply to his comment is that the statutory holidays were put in on a collective bargaining agreement between the union and the employer, and in the granting of the holidays both the union and the employer took the statutory holidays as part and parcel of a wage increase. As a matter of fact, all these matters are charged up to wage costs. They do not go into any special column in the employers' books.

MR. DALEY: What about the Industry and Labour Board, what has that to do with it?

MR. PARK: You are making an argument a few minutes ago that there were places where it was not a matter of collective bargaining. This was a matter of collective bargaining. The Income Tax Department say it is part of the total earnings for the year. You cannot convince your own Workmen's Compensation Board of your argument because the rulings of this matter are directly opposed to the rulings of that board. The Workmen's Compensation Board figure in holidays and everything else, but the Industrial and Labour Board do not. Why do we have two administrative decisions coming out of branches who are responsible to this House through the Department of Labour, one in one direction and the other in a completely different direction.

Votes Nos. 95 to 97 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote 98.

MR. W. DENNISON (CCF St. David): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) bring us up to date on the policy of the department when working men become injured and stand to lose a job they had in a factory? Has his department made any provision whereby certain jobs in factories, certain of the "soft" jobs would be set aside for handicapped people, people who have lost arms or legs and who are prevented from doing their regular jobs?

MR. DALEY: We have a placement officer who endeavours to get these fellows located and he does locate quite a few. I have no authority to say that you have to put a fellow on a softer job because he has been injured. I think they do that. I have never had any complaints from anybody along that line.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to say this. Now, we are heading into a period where it may be more difficult for handicapped people to get jobs and I would like to give this suggestion to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). I think the department should be looking into the responsibilities they may have in a year or so in that connection and, perhaps, they should study the possibility of requiring, particularly in the larger areas, a small percentage of the jobs to be set aside for handicapped people.

MR. DALEY: I think it is a good thought.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 98, Factory Inspection Branch, I would like to ask the hon. Minister

(Mr. Daley) how he inspects the factories in this province, how he expects them to be inspected properly and regularly with the limited appropriation he is asking for it, $13,490? The Public Accounts of last year show an expenditure on salaries of $8,319 for four full-time inspectors. Now, I suggest it is an impossibility, it cannot be done. You cannot inspect factories and you cannot safeguard the life and limb of workers with such an inspection apparatus.

Now, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has said earlier that the Composite Inspection Branch is also inspecting factories. Well, I do not know if that is so, I would welcome information. An hon. member can only go by the Estimates and by the Public Accounts and the Estimates say $13,000 for this province, a ridiculous amount, and the Public Accounts say four people on the staff have an expenditure of $8,000. I say if that is the inspection branch of the department then there is little wonder there are so many industrial accidents and some of them very serious ones.

MR. DALEY: I have already told you, you are just trying to—

MR. SALSBERG: Where is the line between one group and the other?

MR. DALEY: The Factory Inspection Branch and the Composite Inspection Branch are doing practically the same work. I cannot differentiate between them and in addition to that there are the Boiler Inspectors and Engineer Inspectors.

MR. SALSBERG: Why should they not be united if they are doing the same work? I suggest this for the consideration of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) if that is the case— member can only go by what he sees and it is certainly alarming—and if it is the same function, let us have one department and we will know what the duties of the department are.

MR. H. C. NIXON (L Brant): What do you expect to do with Item 4 there?

MR. SALSBERG: That is just it.

MR. NIXON: Item 4 in Vote 98—$50. You cannot do anything with $50 these days.

MR. FROST: Oh, you do all right.

MR. DALEY: I do not think we ever used it. It is just to keep the item open.

MR. NIXON: You do not know of any particular activity that would be carried on?

Votes 98 to 101 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote 102.

MR. L. F. K. FELL (CCF Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, speaking to Vote 102, I notice several items here for various expenditures and salaries particularly and I am wondering just how this particular vote on salaries could be incorporated into a problem which arose last summer in relation to this provincial department for which the Estimates are being made here.

Last summer in the town of Port Colborne The United Packing House Workers' Union were organizing a particular mill, a flour mill. They made application for a vote. The vote was ordered by the Labour Relations Board for a certain date. During the period of time of the actual taking of the vote and the date that the vote was announced to be taken, there became a discussion, or a disagreement, between management and the representative union, or at least the union making the application for votes on behalf of its members. There became a difference of opinion over a group of some 17 employees as to their eligibility to participate in such a vote.

MR. DALEY: There were more than that, I think.

MR. FELL: I beg your pardon?

MR. DALEY: There were more than 17.

MR. FELL: In the case of the first vote, might I inform the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) the number was exactly 17. It was increased during the period

between the taking of the first vote and the period of the taking of the second vote to another number, which eventually could not even be determined, it was so high.

However, in the case of the first vote, Mr. Minister, this difference of opinion regarding the 17 workers arose because of the fact that the particular 17 involved were not considered to be in the unit—that is, as far as the union was concerned, who made no application for representation on their part, did not make an application for the involvement in the application for certification for a vote, whereas the company maintained after the announcement of the date for the taking of the vote had been made, that they must be included, with the result then that we went to a vote at the given date. The result of the vote was very close; in fact, with the exception of the 17 votes, it was doubtful that the union had not won that vote for certification.

The Board ruled in this particular case, because of the argument which arose involving the 17 workers, that the 17 should be included in the bargaining unit. On the basis of that, after a hearing sometime later before the Labour Relations Board a second vote was ordered.

MR. DALEY: How does that get into these Estimates?

MR. FELL: Very closely, because I am going to point out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), if he will permit me to, where I believe the unions have been carrying on work that the Labour Relations Board should have been carrying on, conducting investigations which should have been allowed for in these Estimates, to be carried out by the appropriate officers of this office.

As we went along, the second vote was ordered, and the Labour Relations Board instructed both interested parties that the 17 involved workers should be considered as part and parcel of the bargaining unit. However, Mr. Chairman, the important part now arises whereby the union involved had absolutely no knowledge of who the 17 workers were. All they had was a figure, they had no names, they had no addresses, and had no way of knowing who these people were, or how to contact them and find out what their feelings were in the matter whatsoever.

A second vote was taken, and incidentally the union was not informed of the fact that the ballots of the 17 in question would be counted along with the ballots of the votes which were actually cast at the mill until the exact moment of counting the ballots, when we discovered that the board had sent letters to the 17 workers—which had by this time increased to something like 26 or 27—had sent a registered letter containing a ballot with instructions to fill out the ballot according to their desire and return it to the Ontario Labour Relations Board office. Those ballots were brought to the polling booth by the Returning Officers appointed by the Labour Relations Board on the day the vote was taken, and we did not know what procedure was to be followed in the counting of their ballots until the moment the ballots were to be counted, by which time the Returning Officer informed us the Labour Relations Board had instructed that the ballots, the 27, were to be taken, holus bolus into the ballot boxes and counted along with the rest.

Again, we had no check to know who had voted and who had not voted, and the important question to keep in mind with respect to this discussion, Mr. Minister, is the fact that in every case where a man does not vote, that becomes an automatic vote against the union or the representatives who are applying for certification on behalf of the workers.

We had no way of knowing in this particular case who had voted or who had not voted, and we objected. Over our objection the ballots were counted in that manner. The result of the final count in this case was again extremely close, so we insisted that we have some knowledge of who these people were whom the company felt should be included in the bargaining unit and whom

the Labour Relations Board had decided would be included.

We were given a list of some 27 names, no addresses, just the names; the union then had to set to work to find out who those people were and where they lived. Over a period of some 2½ months, a union representative spent every day and night tracing down these people, and this is what we discovered, Mr. Minister: In many cases of the 27 names which had been submitted to the Labour Relations Board by management, certifying the people were employees of that company and had fulfilled the required number of hours' work under the Act to be qualified as employees of that company, some were out in Vancouver and had not lived in this province for over a year and a half; we found another man in the army who had not worked for nearly two years; we found another case of a man who was serving time in jail, and who was still in jail, and yet he was supposed to have been working within the last 24 hours or so for this company.

MR. DALEY: Did you not say the Labour Relations Board wrote to those men and sent them a ballot and had it returned?

MR. FELL: That is right. They had no ballot returned, Mr. Minister, that is my point. They had no ballot returned, therefore they had no way of knowing whether such a person actually existed, and if so, what his opinion actually was, which meant that his ballot, by not coming back became an automatic vote of "no" against the union which is applying for certification.

MR. DALEY: The only thing I could say to the hon. member (Mr. Fell) upon that, Mr. Chairman, is that the Labour Relations Board, as I have said many times in this House, has never had any political interference. It is composed of equal representatives of labour and management, and it was those people who made this decision, it was not me. I did not even know.

I have heard the story many times since, but I did not make the decision. It was your representative—if you are a union man—it was your representative on the Labour Relations Board who made that decision which instituted that procedure, and I see no place in the Estimates where that has anything to do with them.

If you are thinking that I should include in the Estimates something to pay that investigator investigating these men, well, there is no possible chance, but I do not see—

MR. FELL: I am not suggesting anything of the kind, Mr. Minister. I am not suggesting you should put it in. What I am interested in is knowing whether or not such a provision is already in your Estimates to provide for such investigations as will determine whether or not a person, first of all, is an employee of the company, and secondly, whether or not he is eligible under the bargaining unit to participate in such an important vote as this.

MR. DALEY: We have investigators.

MR. FELL: Well, I hope there is.

MR. DALEY: Sure we have.

MR. FELL: But I did not see the expenditure in that way—I do not see even the word "investigation" on there.

MR. DALEY: We do not itemize everything. It would take a whole book.

MR. FELL: This cost the workers, the union, thousands of dollars over this period of time to investigate the case, and the ultimate result was of course, Mr. Minister, that the union was certified, because we had to bring persons from all over this province—yes, and from outside the province—had to subpoena witnesses to appear here at Queen's Park and swear the company's lists were wrong in front of this board and that cost money. These people lost days of work pay, they lost all sorts of income, their economic income was affected drastically in some cases. One man lost many hundreds of dollars because was in the process of

killing mink on a mink farm and he left and came to Toronto to appear as a witness. In this statement of the company, they sat in the room and insisted he was on the payroll, and he had to get up on oath and testify he had not worked for the company for a year and a half.

Mr. Minister, all I ask is this, that if the votes are going to be taken in this matter under the authority of the Labour Relations Board, then I appeal to you, sir, to see this board not only has the authority but has the direction to investigate every case where a man is asked to participate in a vote as important as this. It is very difficult to get an honest opinion if you have not got the honest facts to deal with, and I think in many cases, in most cases, in any case in point where I personally as a union representative have had any dealings with the Labour Relations Board, I have found them fair, but they do not only deal with me, they have to deal with companies, and if the companies choose to be not fair, or if they choose to be careless, then I think there must be some provision to make sure of the fact that the board and the people involved have to deal with, and in this particular case at tremendous cost to the workers, we finally got the facts and then the company finally acceded to the opinion of the board and everyone involved at the end that they had been wrong. However, it was at tremendous cost and at tremendously long delay in acceding to the wishes of the majority of workers in that particular mill. They lost all sorts of wage increases they should have had, it made their bargaining extremely difficult, and I am firmly convinced the Ontario Labour Relations Board endeavoured to see there is fair play on both sides. I think that is the purpose of it.

I am offering this, not as a criticism, but as a suggestion, Mr. Minister. You can look into this and see some investigation is made. I know representation in this particular case has been made.

MR. DALEY: Yes, I have been in that case a couple of times.

MR. FELL: Unless I am mistaken, Mr. Minister, this particular incident has been included in a brief which was presented to your department, I believe, and we have not heard anything about it yet. I am only interested in offering it as a suggestion in the hopes some action may be taken in future.

Votes Nos. 102 and 103 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (PC Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and begs leave to sit again, and moves its adoption.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Order No. 28.

BARRISTERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 28; second reading of Bill No. 137, "An Act to amend The Barristers Act," Mr. Thornberry.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (CCF Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 137, "An Act to amend The Barristers Act."

In presenting this bill to the House for second reading, I have in mind the fact that a great many people have need of guidance and advice from the legal profession. In that respect the people would like to have some indication from the legal profession, as they do in any profession or any trade, some indication of the standing of the individual.

Now for a great many years The Barristers Act included a section limiting the number of K.C's who could be appointed in one year; they were limited to five per year, with certain exceptions, and it was also provided that a K.C. must have ten years' experience before

the Bar. The section included also a provision that it should not go into force until it was separately proclaimed, and it was never proclaimed. There was, however, an exercise of some restraint in the appointing of K.C's, despite the fact that section was never proclaimed.

In 1946, on motion from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) an amendment to the Barristers' Act was passed, repealing that section, and by a peculiar coincidence, the annual flood of new K.C's since that time has reached some record heights.

AN HON. MEMBER: A washout.

MR. THORNBERRY: Of course, it is felt after this year there will not be any need for creating so many K.C's. I am, therefore, proposing to re-introduce that section, but with a more generous limit of 20 K.C's per year. Apart from the change in figures, the proposed amendment is identical with the Subsection 1 of the original section which was repealed in 1946.

I think hon. members of the House will appreciate the fact that through the years the addition of "K.C." to a barrister's name indicated considerable experience in law. At the time this flood of K.C.'s came on the province, people were rightly concerned about it. Everyone knows if you go to a garage to get work done on a car and the mechanic has a Department of Labour diploma hanging up there, you expect he has covered certain ground and can do the work. You do not want a blacksmith to work on your car.

It is the same with the K.C.; if we go to someone for legal advice, we do not want any "quack" telling us what to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. HAROLD R. SCOTT (PC Minister of Lands and Forests): I am with you, go ahead.

MR. THORNBERRY: It is very seldom that I find myself in agreement with the *Globe and Mail*, but on this particular occasion I would like to quote an editorial from the *Globe and Mail* of Thursday, December 23, 1948.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have all seen it.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (PC Minister of Municipal Affairs): Take it as read.

MR. THORNBERRY: It is entitled:

"MR. BLACKWELL OVERDOES IT"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bye bye, Blackwell.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): That is unfair. He never overdoes it.

MR. THORNBERRY:

"Attorney-General Leslie Blackwell has appointed 446 K.C.'s in five years."

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (CCF High Park): How many was that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. THORNBERRY: 446.

MR. MacLEOD: That is mass production.

MR. THORNBERRY:

"This is far too many. In the four years preceding Mr. Blackwell's assumption of public office, 1939 to 1942, inclusive, the number of Ontario lawyers so honoured was exactly three. Mr. Blackwell's lavish distribution of the title is making it meaningless and that is no service to either the public or the legal profession.

"The designation 'King's' Counsel' is strictly an honour. It confers precedence on a lawyer at state functions and it puts him to the expense of a silk gown. Otherwise it does nothing but notify the public that its bearer has greatly distinguished himself in his calling. At least the letters 'K.C.' are supposed to convey that meaning. They correspond roughly to the letters after a doctor's or an architect's name, indicating that he belongs to the Royal College or institute of his pro-

fession. In Britain, where the title K.C. originated, and where Sir Francis Bacon was the first to hold it, only the truly exceptional barrister wins the distinction.

"Mr. Blackwell has just named 134 new K.C.'s, bringing his four-year total up to the figure already given. His 1948 list is the longest issued at one time in fifteen years. Its length surely cheapens the honour and takes away much of its significance and value. There is no disparagement of any of the new recipients in saying that none of them can feel deeply proud of a decoration shared with eleven dozen others.

"The matter concerns the public as well as members of the Bar. A letter recently published in the *Victoria Colonist,* indicating that Mr. Blackwell is not alone in his offence, makes the point with brutal frankness—"

And this is a quotation from the *Victoria Colonist*:

MR. MACLEOD: And that is a Tory paper.

MR. THORNBERRY:

"'I saw in the *Colonist* that the two political parties in the province are about to suggest King's Counsel. An American, from Wenatchee, I came to British Columbia some time ago to transact some legal business. I employed as my lawyer a K.C., believing that this meant he was an experienced court lawyer. Afterwards I found that this man had no ability in court or in law, and that he got the title as a result of politics. Now this is all very deceiving to the stranger and might I suggest to the lawyers the advisability of cleaning house, abolishing this meaningless business of K.C. It is in the interest of clients dealing with lawyers that it be stopped'."

"We do not agree with the Wenatchee man's suggestion, believing that the giving of professional honours is a good custom and an incentive to integrity and diligence. But the title K.C. might as well be abolished if it is to be used for the political purposes to which Mr. Blackwell is obviously putting it. He is a candidate for the provincial leadership of his party. Possibly, he supposes that a generous sprinkling of legal titles will do him some good in this contest. If so, we hope he is mistaken. Certainly he serves neither the bar nor the public when he turns a badge of honour into a handout for party or personal services rendered or expected."

AN HON. MEMBER: Bye, bye Blackwell.

MR. THORNBERRY: For that reason, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members of this House can agree that this is an amendment to the Barristers' Act which needs to be introduced again to this Legislature, so that the public can have confidence again in the letters "K.C." after a lawyer's name, instead of making it meaningless, when it will be more distinctive not to have a "K.C." than it is to have one.

MR. DUNBAR: I would like to take some responsibility for this, and not have the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) shoulder all this responsibility. I made three recommendations for King's Counsel, Allister McDonald, President of the Liberal Association at Ottawa, Russell Dick, who was the Returning Officer when I came in, appointed by the Liberal Party, and one Conservative—I do not know what he is. When I say "Conservative," he says he is. His name is Rowan, in Ottawa. Of these three, McDonald and Dick are outstanding Liberals. Allister (Mr. McDonald) is now president of the Liberal Association in Ottawa, and Mr. Rowan—well, I cannot say what his politics were. They asked for it, and I recommended them to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), so I do not think I should sit idly by and let the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) "take the rap."

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say that the list which was brought out

last December—and previous lists also —were the responsibility of all members of counsel. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has been singled out for responsibility, because this comes through his department, but the fact of the matter is that this government all took responsibility. The list was approved by everybody over here, and the truth of the matter is that the list was a pretty good list. I would like to say, to my hon. friend for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) that amongst the ones appointed was the leader of his own party. That is how political we have been. We appointed the leader of his own party as King's Counsel, and he did not disclaim the honour. We also appointed the head of the CCF organization in Ontario, Andrew Brewin, a K.C., but after seeing the way he "messed up" the election business in St. George's riding. I think possibly we made a terrible mistake. May I also say that one of the others which my friend the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) asked about was the appointment of the hon. member for South Cochrane in this House (Mr. Grummett). If we have made mistakes, the mistakes included some people in his own party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the motives of the mover of this bill are good and healthy, and I am frank to say, in my view, this is a very frivolous bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: And if it came to a vote, I could not possibly support it. But if we reach the committee stage, I should feel inclined to move an amendment which would make these clauses retroactive to 1943, and thereby repair some of the damage which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is alleged to have done, by his open-handed policy.

Every hon. member in this House knows that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is no political friend of mine, but I cannot bring myself to say that he has been partisan in awarding these K.C.'s. I know of many people in all parties, with the exception of the Labour-Progressive Party, who have received these appointments. One of the first actions of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) in this province, as was pointed out a moment ago, was the conferring of the "K.C." on the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Grummett), and in the last year, Mr. Rowan appeared on the list, and I do not think he should be rapped over the knuckles for doing that. If the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) feels that this mass production is getting out of hand, and he wants to limit it to the number designated in this bill, then I think the bill should also contain some suggestion as to the standards by which the Minister's (Mr. Blackwell) conferring of the K.C.'s should be governed. After all, what particular merit is there in 10 or 20? If you restrict it to that number, then you might be conferring the K.C.'s on 10 or 20 mediocrities, whereas if you have a field of 100 or more to draw from, it is barely possible that some competent person might get the K.C.

I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has been following standard practise in this respect, and if the Law Society of this province wants to lay down certain rules and regulations as to the individuals upon whom the K.C.'s are to be conferred, I feel sure the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) would feel inclined to accommodate himself to the feeling and the wishes of the Law Society.

But as the bill stands now, I must repeat, with all deference to my hon. friend (Mr. Thornberry) that I think it is frivolous, and is not a worthwhile contribution to the legislative programme of this body. I do not think it will accomplish anything. As I said a moment ago, it may actually have the effect of restricting this title to a smaller number of people, who may not

have any especial claim to it. I will, of course, be interested in hearing what the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has to say, but I think that in view of the policy he has pursued up to now, we should be fair and generous with him, and if the *Globe and Mail* wants to take him apart, I think there are other grounds on which they can do that job better than that contained in the editorial which the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) read to us.

So, Mr. Speaker, if there is a recorded vote on this bill, I shall certainly vote against it, but if it has the good fortune—or the misfortune—to reach committee stage, I will consider moving an amendment making it retroactive to 1942.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the statement that the bill is entirely frivolous; certainly no one could describe the *Globe and Mail* as a frivolous newspaper, whatever else may be thought about it. It is a grimly serious newspaper, and by no stretch of the imagination could be described as "frivolous."

However, I think the real point of the bill is being overlooked. There has been no charge against the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) that the awarding of K.C.'s during the last six years, since he has held that office, have been made in a partisan manner.

MR. FROST: That is what your "side-kick" endeavoured to convey, to the best of his ability.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh no.

MR. FROST: Oh yes he did.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think the hon. members of the government should take the matter in such a personal way. Actually there is a very real problem here, I think. Reference has been made to the fact that the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) and myself were appointed K.C.'s.

MR. FROST: And Mr. Brewin.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is perfectly true. And what is more, a great many Liberals have been appointed K.C.'s during the past five or six years. The gist of the argument which has been presented is not that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has been unfair in awarding the K.C.'s, or that he has once in a while awarded a lot of K.C.'s to people who did not deserve them. The gist of the matter is there have been too many. I think that argument is a good one, and it arises from something for which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is possibly not responsible, but for which the Legislature itself is responsible.

The fact is that every Attorney-General of whom I know has been under a great deal of pressure to grant K.C.'s to members of the legal profession, some of whom deserved it, and some of whom did not.

There are many different ways in which that pressure can be and has been applied, and it seems to me that the proper method of escaping from that difficulty, so far as the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) is concerned, is for the Legislature either to limit the number who are appointed each year, or to provide for some other procedure.

I may say for the information of the House, if the House will forgive a reference to another province, that the provisions of a certain Act in Saskatchewan correspond very closely to this part of the Barristers' Act in Ontario, and in 1945 the King's Counsel Act—as it is called in Saskatchewan—was amended to the following effect. Section 2 of the Act was made to provide as follows:

> "Provided that no appointment shall be made unless it is first approved by a committee consisting of the Attorney-General, the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan, the Chief Justice of the King's Bench, and two Benchers of the Law Society of Saskatchewan, to be appointed for that purpose in convocation."

This proposal, of course, is not put forward in the bill introduced by the

hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry), but it seems to me if the number is limited, and if some other safeguards were introduced, it would actually assist the hon Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) and protect him from being importuned by a great many people who may or may not have good reason to expect appointments as K.C.'s.

I believe that as far as the last six years are concerned some counsel have made applications for appointments. Some have had strong recommendations made for their appointments, and in some other cases I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has perhaps acted on his own in the belief that the appointments would be justified, whether applications were made or not. It may well be, as somebody suggested, that it was a great mistake for the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) to bring about the appointment of people like myself. That seems to me to be very much beside the point, as far as this bill is concerned.

The question raised by this bill is whether there is any point in continuing the practise of appointing the K.C.'s in Ontario, is anywhere from 25 to 50 per cent. or 60 per cent. of the practising barristers in the province are to be given that distinction.

I do not know whether the hon. members of the House are aware of it, but the origin of this practice in Great Britain is of interest, and it certainly goes to show that the conditions in this country are not the same entirely as they are in Britain.

In Great Britain the appointment of King's Counsel is on an entirely different basis. Of the many thousands who are entitled to practice at the British Bar, there are very few who are ever appointed King's Counsel. The reason for that is not so much that there is any legal limitation to the number to be appointed, but, as the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) undoubtedly knows, counsel make application when they wish to do so, and usually when they are fairly certain that the appointment will be made. It is their responsibility to make application, and there is considerable risk in making it, because the King's Counsel at the British Bar find they cannot appear in court without a junior; they must be paid at a considerably higher rate than the junior, and they are entitled to accept only certain classes of work, and therefore some of the leading members of the British Bar are quite unwilling to become King's Counsel, and continue to the end of their days technically juniors, with very large practices, because they do not wish to accept the limitations put upon them should they become King's Counsel.

But in this country the experience has been quite different owing to different conditions. The practice has grown in almost every province I think, and almost every Attorney-General has been besieged by lawyers who wish to be honoured by the appointment. I suggest that this has been more of a headache than it is worth to our hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), and probably to many of the others, and the time has come when there should be some limitation on the number of appointments, and perhaps also when the government should give consideration to some procedure such as that which has been adopted in Saskatchewan, where the Attorney-General is relieved of the exclusive responsibility of making the decisions, and it is provided by the statute that no appointment shall be made except upon the recommendation of the Attorney-General, the Chief Justice of the province, the Chief Justice of the King's Bench and two persons designated by the Benchers of the Law Society. That seems to me to be the correct solution to what has been a problem to the legal profession, and certainly a problem to our Attorneys-General.

MR. C. C. CALDER (L London): Mr. Speaker, at this witching hour you won't want many words. May I say that I oppose this bill on public and professional grounds. I agree with the article read from the Victoria publica-

tion, that a K.C. should mean something, and unless the public know what it is, they are apt to be misled.

Speaking personally, I would like to see the British system instituted here whereby a man on his own free enterprise, if he thought he had reached that point of skill, would apply for a K.C. and take the risk that goes with it.

On professional grounds I sympathize with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) because his practice merely reflects the current professional attitude in Ontario, which seems to be that the K.C. should be a sort of legion of honour, without any high technical qualifications necessarily attached thereto. They are even appointed on such irrelevant grounds as membership in this Legislature, which I would not like to see generally applied.

For that reason, I think that the title of K.C., when we can bring public opinion to the point, should be restored to that high lustre which it enjoys in Britain.

MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Speaker, possibly it might be helpful to the House if I were to review my own attitude on this question since taking office here in 1943. What happened in relation to most of my predecessors in office would be that they would bring out a very large list at New Year's on a certain year, and then they would receive the same sort of a blast from the press that I received editorially in the *Globe and Mail* on the occasion of the last list, and they would then become extremely fearful, and after that if anyone merely mentioned the words "K.C." they would shudder, and would have nothing to do with it for years. And I might say when I came into office in 1943 that was the situation with which I was met. There had not been a list for a very considerable time, and so, what I was confronted with, and what I am now dealing with, is not the accumulation of nearly six years, but the accumulation of nearly nine years, and I feel I should make that plain to the House.

Now, the second thing I should explain to the House—I am thoroughly familiar with the English system and the fact is, there, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has indicated, the Lord Chancellor appoints people on their own application, and when they make that application, if they are of good character, and they have some reasonable standing at the bar, and having reason that they can make a living as K.C., it would be very unusual for the Lord Chancellor to refuse the application of a barrister in Britain of good character who, in his opinion, could make a living at it and consequently the King's Counsel situation in Britain, where they have a divided profession, represents really one of those instances of the genius of the British people of having so many things that are almost self-regulating.

Now, it is quite impossible to apply that system to the Province of Ontario, because here we have a profession where the people are practicing both solicitor and barrister profession at the same time, and where, having regard to the constitution of our courts it would simply mean that appointment as King's Counsel would centre in the large centres and in sparsely settled areas such as we have in the Province of Ontario, it would simply mean a person —no matter whether he had obtained certain ability in court—nevertheless would not have the volume of business as King's Counsel that would give him a living and then you would have them confined in cities and large towns only, and I do not think that would be acceptable to either King's Counsels or the public.

With that background, I was seriously troubled as to what course I should take before I took office and I conferred with the Law Society whether they had any advice to give me. At that time they were not prepared to take the responsibility of making any recommendations. So, left to my own devices in the matter, I was confronted with this situation: that at that time there were a substantial number of people appointed in the province, many of whom had been appointed when not very long at the bar, and I hope that

the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) will not take offence at what I have to say, because I think it applies not only to my predecessors in office in that government, but also in preceding governments, that the appointments were absolutely top-heavy for the government in power, and so that represented an accumulation of about 8 years, where Liberals of any standing at all they received recognition in the appointments and those belonging to other political parties, much lesser recognition.

So, having to meet that picture, I took the general view that the legal profession was a highly competitive profession, and that that appointment, by and large, should not be used to confirm competitive advantages on many lawyers as opposed to other lawyers of equal ability. So I established some rather rough and ready rules to guide me, and what I did—I took the position I would not appoint any lawyers under approximately 15 years at the Bar unless prior to that 15 years they had exhibited a standing in litigation that was approximately equivalent to that which brought about the appointment of K.C.'s in Britain, and if anyone cares to examine the total number of appointments that have been made during the time I have been in office, I think that they will find there have been only 5 or 6 appointments in all during that period of lawyers under 15 years at the Bar, and I think, if they examine the names of those appointed for the last 25 years, they will agree they are outstanding counsel.

Now, coming to over 15 years at the Bar you met a situation throughout this province—there are lawyers that are competent as counsel in our smaller towns and smaller centres throughout the province, but where they could not possibly expect to have a volume of counsel work such as people who are practicing the profession of barrister only in large centres such as Toronto. Well, from 15 years up to 25 years we give those people recognition, and then for a period of 25 years, which is a substantial time at the Bar, we have tried to give recognition to lawyers who have a good reputation and some sort of decent practice in the province and who have made some profession of activity in the province—whether it is community activity or political activity. I do not think political activity should be a detriment to anybody irrespective of what political party he may choose as the medium of engaging in that political activity. I happen to be one person who feels that is a commendable activity.

Now, that is roughly the design I followed, and in that I attempted to give recognition to people irrespective of what their political party may be, and it is a matter that gives me very considerable satisfaction that, having devised these rough-and-ready rules to follow—that they met with favour with my Cabinet colleagues and they met with the favour of the government supporters in the Legislature, and it is a matter of great pride to me that when in their localities—a member either of my own party or another party felt that a lawyer of any political party had reached the time under circumstances I mentioned that he should receive consideration, that has been brought to my attention pretty well without regard for political partisanship, and I had put that before the House, Mr. Speaker, as being somewhat of an improvement in dealing with the prerogative of the Crown to appoint King's Counsel in the Province of Ontario, but I want to say very emphatically that the only possible basis of change would be to settle on some definite standards, to govern the appointment, and if there was an ultimate solution to this establishing of standards, and I want to illustrate that by my second conference with the Law Society. I am familiar with what is in the Saskatchewan legislation, and I presume that was the result of representations probably made by the Law Society of that province. The reason I say that, is, that sometime ago the representative of the Law Society came to me and they suggested those very provisions of the Saskatchewan bill to me, and I took this position: that the

mere spreading of the responsibility over the Chief Justice of Ontario and the Chief Justice of the High Court and two Benchers of the Law Society, merely meant that five people would be importuned instead of one, and I can assure you that even from the judges, I have a recommendation that they would not take the responsibility of recommending through the council, as a whole to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and I took the position then with the Law Society if they were to come forward and they were to suggest standards that would govern the appointment of K.C.'s, some set standard whereby if a lawyer in this province measured up to it, he would get appointed and if he did not qualify he would not. I am not considering it on this basis. If that was established every lawyer in the province who did not meet this standard would have to surrender his K.C. and every lawyer could come forward and apply under those standards because it must be apparent that it is quite unfair to all younger lawyers coming along in this province that 35 per cent. of the legal profession should receive a K.C. without any standard and they should be subject to a definite standard. I might say that the Law Society is not prepared to make a recommendation to my government of such a standard for consideration, and therefore I put it to the Legislature that, irrespective of the editorials that may be written about it, which are perfectly all right as far as I am concerned, as far as the expression of opinion goes, everybody is entitled to their opinion and to express it—but, as far as I am concerned as long as I continue to hold the office of Attorney-General, subject to that free expression of opinion and subject to what I have said here tonight, I propose continuing to examine the applications and the recommendations that are made to me on this question, and to proceed with appointments of the oncoming members of the legal profession of the Province of Ontario, until some better system is devised.

Now, I might say as far as the end of that editorial is concerned, that even that did not concern me, and I had not the slightest objection to the member who wanted to read that tonight, because, if you want to boil it down, it did me a great deal of good and therefore I rather like it, despite the terms in which it was expressed.

As I said, I seldom find myself in agreement with the *Globe and Mail* and perhaps the *Globe and Mail* was more concerned with harpooning Mr. Blackwell than I was. I do not think I am as much concerned with that as the *Globe and Mail,* but the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) suggested because a K.C. was awarded to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. member for South Cochrane (Mr. Grummett) and Mr. Brewin, that that would be a good reason why we should appoint wholesale any number of K.C.'s. I think that does not add anything to the political stature of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) when he says Mr. Brewin does not deserve one because of the way he messed up the St. George election.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): That is right, if that is an indication of his legal ability.

MR. THORNBERRY: I think after watching the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) as chairman of that committee—

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, we are not discussing the legal committee at all.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) did.

MR. SPEAKER: He just happened to mention his name. The hon. member who is now speaking is going into the matter of procedure of this particular committee. I think we should confine ourselves.

HON. MR. FROST: I have no objection to have him refer to me; I care little for what he says about myself.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) made what I consider to be a slanderous statement about the gentleman in question and I think the hon. member is entitled to reply.

HON. MR. FROST: Why don't you reply?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I did not think about it.

HON. MR. FROST: You would not bother about it.

MR. THORNBERRY: It was an uncalled-for statement.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney-General): You licked your lips when you read it in the *Globe and Mail.*

MR. THORNBERRY: Earlier tonight the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile) brought in a measure to give some protection to tourists. In a sense, this is the same particular kind of bill; I think 20 would be ample, with 100 appointments in 5 years, that would be ample to those qualified and deserving. I cannot see where any hon. member would have any objection to these particular amendments which previously were on the Statute but deleted in 1946. This would simply put them back with a more generous distribution and replacing 5 by 20. For that reason I urge the members to accept.

HON. MR. BLACKWELL: You still want it.

The House divided on second reading of Bill 137.

AYES: 15
NAYS: 54

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): I want to call Order No. 13.

THE ELECTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 13th Order; second reading of Bill No. 64, "An Act to amend The Election Act," Mr. MacLeod.

HON. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, the reason I arise when the name of the hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) is on the bill is that we have this particular order which deals with the Election Act and two other orders dealing with the Election Act.

In relation to the one that stands in the hon. member's name (Mr. MacLeod), he enquired from me this afternoon whether the government proposed to establish a select committee of the Legislature in relation to the Election Acts and I told him then that I would consider that and I would discuss it with the Acting Premier (Mr. Frost).

The hon. members will recall that we had such a committee in 1945 that brought in recommendations and that actually a bill was submitted which was not enacted during that session by reason of the dissolution of the Legislature. It has been in my mind that there have been a number of views advanced in relation to the Election Acts since that time, and that it was desirable early in the life of the present Legislature to establish such a committee.

I might say that if the hon. member in whose name this bill stands (Mr. MacLeod) and the hon. members in whose names the other bills stand having to do with the electoral machinery are satisfied with that solution, that the government would propose the establishment, before the ending of this session, of a select committee, that would then sit between sessions and leisurely, in a proper way, give the whole of our electoral machinery the best possible consideration, on that understanding I would suggest the hon. members in question might consent, without debate, to permit Orders No. 13 and 16, or any other bills that I have missed here, on our electoral machinery, to be included in the terms of reference to that select committee.

I would ask the hon. members who are concerned with such bills to give that consideration because I am authorized to state on behalf of the government that we consider it desirable to

establish a select committee for that purpose.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (LP Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell), I hasten to say that so far as we are concerned we should be very glad to withdraw with the unanimous consent of the House both Bills 64 and 67, so that they may be considered by the select committee which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) proposes to set up.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PC Provincial Treasurer): Would the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) move that the order be discharged and the bill withdrawn in that item and Item 16.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (CCF Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps before that is done, I would like to say a word about this proposal, if I may have the floor, Mr. Speaker?

I do not think there are any bills standing in the names of hon. members of this group referring to the Election Act. There may be a resolution on the subject. The whole thing was considered and the reason there are no bills on that—there is one resolution standing in the name of this group—is that we had hoped the government would see its way clear to make the proposal that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) has just made. We felt that was the proper way in which to go at our election law and it is preferable to taking a hack here and a chew there. It would be far preferable to reviewing the whole thing again in a committee. For that reason, I have no hesitation in saying that the hon. members of this group welcome the proposal of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell).

MR. FROST: That would mean that the resolution would also go?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The resolution in the name of the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison).

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, to clear things up, I move that Orders 13 and 16 be discharged. I move that Bill No. 64 and Bill No. 67 be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to Bills Nos. 64 and 67 withdrawn.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I move that Motion No. 2, standing in my name, be withdrawn and the order be discharged.

Motion approved; notice of Motion No. 2 discharged.

MR. FROST: Having reached a point of amity and agreement, I move that the House do now adjourn.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, before that motion is carried, there are one or two things I would like to take up. One is, of course, we would appreciate an indication of what business you have in mind for tomorrow and whether a night session is to be expected? This afternoon, to be technically correct about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should be correct.

MR. FROST: Well, we will proceed tomorrow with certain items still on the Order Paper. We will proceed with some of the orders and then proceed with Estimates. I am anxious to get the Estimates cleaned up. Tomorrow is the 29th and it is highly desirable to get the Estimates cleaned up because of the end of the fiscal year at the end of this month.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is Bills and Estimates with the emphasis on Estimates. That is rather nebulous but it will have to do. There is another question. I think all hon. members of the House on this side have heard with some regret and with some sense of disturbance about the illnesses which have befallen the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea) and also the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. McPhee). Now, the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) may not be in a position at the moment to tell us how the hon.

members are progressing but if he could I am sure that the House would be glad to hear what the latest news is. We all have a sense of regret that two hon. members should suffer this misfortune when we are drawing to the end of the session. We wish them well and if there is any news of them we would be glad to hear it.

MR. FROST: I will have news for you tomorrow.

MR. MACLEOD: Will there be a night session tomorrow night?

MR. FROST: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.45 of the clock a.m.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCÉDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2